LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 9 1965
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BX 4819 .B6713 1836 v.2
Bossuet, Jacques Baenigne,
1627-1704.
The history of the
variations of the

BOSSUET'S HISTORY

OF THE

VARIATIONS OF THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

THE HISTORY
OF THE
VARIATIONS
OF THE
PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

BY

JACQUES BENIGNE BOSSUET,

BISHOP OF CONDOM AND MEAUX,

PRIVY-COUNSELLOR OF LOUIS XIV., PRECEPTOR TO THE DAUPHIN, AND CHIEF ALMONER TO THE DAUPHINESS.

SECOND EDITION.
IN TWO VOLUMES.
TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.
VOL. II.

DUBLIN:
PRINTED BY RICHARD COYNE,
BOOKSELLER, PRINTER, AND PUBLISHER, TO THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF ST. PATRICK, MAYNOOTH.
1836.

THE HISTORY

OF THE

VARIATIONS OF PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

BOOK X.

[From the Year 1558 to 1570.]

A Brief Summary:—Queen Elizabeth's Reformation.—That of Edward corrected, and the Real Presence, which had been condemned under that Prince, held for indifferent: The Church of England still persists in this sentiment.—Other Variations of this Church in that Queen's reign.—Her ecclesiastical Supremacy moderated in appearance, in reality left in the same state as under Henry and Edward, notwithstanding the scruples of Elizabeth.—Policy bears the sway throughout this whole Reformation.—The Faith, the Sacraments, and the whole ecclesiastical authority delivered up into the hands of Kings and Parliaments.—The same done in Scotland.—The Calvinists of France disapprove this doctrine, nevertheless let it pass.—England's doctrine upon Justification.—Queen Elizabeth favours the French Protestants.—They rebel as soon as they have it in their power.—The conspiracy of Amboise, in Francis the Second's reign.—The civil wars under Charles IX.—This conspiracy and these wars appertain to Religion, and were entered into by the authority of the doctors and ministers of the party, and grounded on the new doctrine teaching the lawfulness of making war against their prince, for the sake of Religion.—This doctrine expressly warranted by their national Synods.—The fallacy of Protestant writers, and of Mr. Burnet amongst the rest, who pretend that the tumult of Amboise and the civil wars were state affairs.—Religion was at the bottom of Francis Duke of Guise's murder.—Beza's and the Admiral's testimony.—A new Confession of Faith in Switzerland.

1.—*Queen Elizabeth is persuaded nothing can secure to her the Crown, but the Protestant Religion. Four points she was uneasy about.*

England having soon returned, after Queen Mary's death to Edward the Sixth's Reformation, set about fixing her Faith and putting the finishing stroke to her religion by the new Queen's authority. Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII. and Anne Boleyn, was advanced to the throne, and governed her kingdom with as profound a policy as the most able kings. The step she had taken with regard to Rome, immediately upon her coming to the crown, countenanced what otherwise had been published of this princess, that she would not have departed from the Catholic Religion, had she found the Pope more disposed to her interests. Paul IV., who then sat in the Apostolic Chair, gave no favourable reception to the civilities she had caused to be tendered him as to another prince, without further declaration of her mind, by the resident of the late queen her sister*. Mr. Burnet tells us, he treated her as illegitimate; was surprised at her great boldness in assuming the crown, a fief of the Holy See, without his consent; and gave her no hopes of receiving any favour at his hands, unless she renounced her pretensions, and submitted to the See of Rome. Such usage, if true, was not at all likely to reclaim a queen. After such a repulse, Elizabeth readily withdrew from a See, by whose decrees her birth had also been condemned, and engaged in the new Reformation: yet she did not approve that of Edward in all its parts. There were four points which caused her uneasiness†, that of Ceremonies, that of Images, that of the Real Presence, and that of the Regal Supremacy; and what was done, in her time, with reference to these four points, we are now to relate.

2.—*First Point: Ceremonies.*

As for ceremonies, "Her first impressions," says Mr. Burnet, "were in favour of such old rites as her father had still retained, and in her own nature loving state and some magnificence in Religion, she thought her brother's ministers had stript it too much of external ornaments, and left religion too bare and naked. Yet I do not find she did any thing considerable in that regard‡."

---

* Burn. l. iii. p. 374. † Ibid. p. 376. ‡ Ibid.

3.—*Second Point: Images. Pious sentiments of the Queen.*

As for Images, "That matter stuck long with her; for she inclined to keep up Images in churches, and it was with great difficulty she was prevailed upon, persuaded as she was that the use of Images in churches might be a means to stir up devotion, and that at least it would draw all people to frequent them the more*." Herein her sentiments agreed in the main with those of the Catholics. If they stir up devotion towards God, they might well excite also the external tokens of it; this is the whole of that worship which we pay them. To be inclined to, and have favourable impressions of them in this sense, like Queen Elizabeth, was not so gross a notion as is at present imputed to our belief; and I much question whether Mr. Burnet would venture to charge a queen, who, according to him, was the foundress of religion in England, with entertaining idolatrous sentiments. But the Iconoclast party had gained their point; the queen, unable to resist them, was wrought up by them to such extremes, that not content with commanding Images to be cast out of all churches, she forbade all her subjects to keep them in their houses †; nothing but the Crucifix escaped ‡, and that no where but in the Royal Chapel, whence the queen could not be persuaded to remove it.

4.—*They persuade her with reasons evidently bad.*

It may not be improper to consider what the Protestants alleged in order to induce her to this injunction against Images, in order that the excess or vanity of the thing may be discovered. The chief foundation of their reasons is, "that the second commandment forbids the making of any Images, as a resemblance of God §," which evidently proves nothing either against the Images of Jesus Christ as man, or those of the saints, or, in general, against such, with respect to which we publicly declare (as does the Catholic Church) that by them we in no wise pretend to represent the Deity. The rest is too extravagant to bear repeating: for either it concludes just nothing, or it concludes for the absolute prohibition of the use of painting and sculpture,—a weakness now-a-days so universally exploded by all Christians, as only to find place in the gross superstition of Mahometans and Jews.

---

* Burn. l. iii. pp. 397 and 376.

† Ibid. 398.

‡ Thuan. l. xxi., An. 1559.

§ Burn. Ibid. p. 397.

5.—*Manifest Variation with respect to the Real Presence.—Policy regulates Religion.*

The queen shewed more resolution on the subject of the Eucharist. It is of main importance well to comprehend her sentiments, such as Mr. Burnet delivers them: "She thought that in her brother's reign they made their doctrine too narrow in some points; therefore she intended to have some things explained in more general terms, that so all parties might be comprehended by them*." These were her sentiments in general. In applying them to the Eucharist, "Her intention was to have the manner of Christ's presence in the Sacrament be left in some *general* words. She very much disliked that those who believed the corporal presence had been driven away from the Church by too nice an explanation of it." And again, "it was proposed to have the communion book so contrived, that it might not exclude the belief of the corporal presence; for the chief design of the Queen's council was to unite the nation in one faith†."

One might be apt to think, perchance, that the Queen judged it needless to make any express declarations against the real presence, her subjects of themselves being sufficiently inclined to reject it: but, on the contrary, "the greatest part of the nation continued to believe such a presence. Therefore, it was recommended to the divines to see that there should be no express definition made against it; that so it might lie as a speculative opinion, not determined, in which every man was left to the freedom of his own mind.‡"

6.—*The Faith of the pretended Martyrs changed.*

Here was a strange variation in one of the main fundamental points of the English Reformation. In the Confession of Faith set forth in 1551, under Edward, the doctrine of the Real Presence was excluded in so strong a manner, that it was declared impossible and contrary to our Lord's ascension. When Cranmer was condemned for a heretic in Queen Mary's time, he owned the capital subject of his condemnation was, his not confessing a corporal presence of our Saviour on the altar. Ridley, Latimer, and others, the pretended martyrs of the English Reformation, mentioned by Mr. Burnet, all suffered for the same cause. Calvin says as much of the French martyrs, whose authority he opposes against the Lutherans[*]. This article was esteemed of that high importance even in 1549, and during the whole reign of Edward, "that when the reformation was to be carried on to the establishment of a form of doctrine," says Mr. Burnet, "which should contain the chief points of religion, inquiry was chiefly made concerning the presence of Christ in the sacrament." It was, therefore, at that time, not only one of the fundamental points, but also a capital one amongst these fundamentals. As it was of such concern, and the principal cause for which these boasted martyrs shed their blood, it could not be explained in terms too distinct. After so clear an exposition of it as that which had been made under Edward, to return, as did Elizabeth, to general terms, which left the thing undetermined, that all parties might be comprehended in them, and every man left to the freedom of his own mind, was betraying truth, and putting error on the level with it. In a word, these general terms in a confession of faith, were nothing but a fallacy in the most serious of all concerns, and wherein the utmost sincerity is required. This is what the English reformers ought to have represented to Elizabeth. But policy outbalanced religion, nor was it now to their purpose so greatly to condemn the Real Presence. Wherefore, the twenty-ninth article of Edward's confession, wherein it was condemned, was very much changed, and a great deal left out[†]; all that shewed the Real Presence was impossible and contradictory to the residence of Christ's body in heaven. "All this was suppressed," says Mr. Burnet, "and that expressed definition dashed over with minium." The historian takes care to tell us it is still legible; but that even is a testimony against the expunged doctrine. They would have it still legible, to the end a proof might be extant, that this was the very point which they had concluded to reverse. They had remonstrated to Queen Elizabeth concerning images, "that it would cast a great reflection on the first reformers, should they again set up in churches what these so zealous martyrs of the evangelical purity had so carefully removed[‡]." It was of no less a criminal nature, to rescind from the Confession of Faith of these pretended martyrs, what they had placed in it, in opposition to the Real Presence, and to annul that doctrine, in testimony whereof they had given up their lives. Instead of their plain and express definitions, they were content to say, conformably to Queen Elizabeth's design, "in general terms, that the body of Christ is given and received after a spiritual manner; and the means by which it is received, is Faith*." The first part of the article is very true, taking spiritual manner for a manner that is above our senses and nature, as the Catholics and Lutherans understand it; nor is the second part less certain, taking the reception for a profitable reception, and in the sense St. John meant, when he said of Jesus Christ, "that his own received him not†," although he were in the world in person in the midst of them; that is to say, they neither received his doctrine nor his grace. Furthermore, what was added in Edward's Confession, with reference to the communion of the wicked who receive nothing but the symbols, was cut off in like manner, and care was taken that nothing but what the Catholics and Lutherans might approve, should be retained with respect to the Real Presence.

---

* Burn. l. iii. p. 376. † Ibid. 392. ‡ Ibid.

---

[*] Calv. dilucid. explic. opusc. p. 861. p. ii., l. i. p. 104.

[†] Ibid. l. iii. pp. 405, 406.

[‡] P, 397.

7.—*Substantial Changes in Edward's Liturgy.*

For the same reason, whatever condemned the corporal presence, was now changed in Edward's liturgy: for instance, the rubrick there explained the reason for kneeling at the sacrament, "that thereby no adoration is intended to any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood, because that is only in heaven‡." But, under Elizabeth, these words were lopped off, and the full liberty of adoring the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ was allowed as present in the eucharist. What the pretended martyrs and founders of the English Reformation had held for gross idolatry, became an innocent action in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In Edward's second liturgy, these words, which had been left standing in the first, were taken away: viz., "the body or the blood of Jesus Christ preserve thy body and thy soul to everlasting life;" but these words, which Edward had left out because they seemed too much to favour the belief of the corporal presence, were replaced by Queen Elizabeth§. The will of kings became the rule of faith, and what we now see removed by this Queen, was again inserted in the common-prayer book by King Charles II.

8.—*An imposition of Mr. Burnet; who has the assurance to say, that the Doctrine established by Edward was not changed.*

Notwithstanding all these changes in such essential matters, Mr. Burnet would make us believe there was no variation in the doctrine of the English reformation. "The doctrine of the Church," says he, "was at that time contrary to the belief of a real or corporal presence in the sacrament, in like manner as at present: only, it was not thought necessary or expedient to publish it in too distinct a manner*;" as if one could speak too distinctly in matters of faith. But this is not all. It is a manifest variation in doctrine, not only to embrace what is contrary to it, but to leave undecided what was decided formerly. If the ancient Catholics, after deciding in express terms the Son of God's equality with his Father, had suppressed what they had pronounced at Nice, contenting themselves with barely calling him God in general terms, and in the sense the Arians could not deny it, insomuch that what had been decided so expressly should have become undecided and indifferent, would they not have altered the church's faith, and stepped backwards? Now, this is what was done under Elizabeth by the Church of England; and none can acknowledge it more clearly than Mr. Burnet has done in the words above-cited, where it stands confessed in express terms, that it was neither by chance, nor forgetfulness, but from a premeditated design, that they omitted the words used in Edward's time, and that "no express definition was made against the corporal presence†;" on the contrary, it was let lie as a speculative opinion, not determined, in which every man was left to the freedom of his own mind to reject or embrace it: in this manner, either sincerely or politically, the faith of the reformers was forsaken, and the dogma of the corporal presence left for indifferent, against which they had combated even unto blood.

---

* Calv. dilucid. explic. opusc. l. iii. p. 405.

† John i. 10, 11.

‡ P. ii. p. 392.

§ Ibid. l. i. p. 170.

9.—*England indifferent as to the Real Presence.*

This, if we believe Mr. Burnet, is yet the present state of the church of England. It was on these grounds that the bishop William Bedell, whose life he has written, believed that a great company of Lutherans who had fled to Dublin for refuge, might without difficulty communicate with the church of England‡, "which in reality," says Mr. Burnet, "hath so great a moderation in that matter (the Real Presence) that no positive definition of the manner of the presence being made, men of different sentiments may agree in the same acts of worship, without being obliged to declare their opinion, or being understood to do any thing contrary to their several persuasions." Thus hath the church of England corrected her teachers, and reformed her first reformers.

---

* Burn. l. iii. p. 406. † P. 392.

‡ Life of B. Bedell, pp. 137, 138.

10.—*Neither the word substance nor miracles, which Calvin places in the Eucharist, are admitted by them.*

Moreover, the English reformation neither under Edward nor Elizabeth, ever employed, in the explanation of the Eucharist, the substance of the body, nor those incomprehensible operations which Calvin so much exalts. These expressions too much favoured a real presence, and it was for this reason they were not made use of either in Edward's reign, when that was designedly excluded, or in Elizabeth's, when the thing was to be left undetermined; and England was very sensible that these words of Calvin, little suitable to the doctrine of the figurative sense, could not be introduced into it otherwise, than by forcing too visibly their natural sense.

11.—*The Queen's Supremacy in spirituals is established in spite of all her scruples.*

The article of Supremacy now remains to be considered. True it is, Elizabeth opposed it, and this title, of Head of the Church, in her judgment too great for kings, seemed to her still more insupportable in a queen, not to say ridiculous. "A famous preacher among those of the reformation," says Mr. Burnet, "put this scruple about it in her head*;" that is, some remains of shame were still to be met with in the English Church; nor was it without some little remorse that she gave up her authority to the secular power; but policy got the better even in this point. As much ashamed as the queen was in her heart of this title of the church's supreme head, she accepted of it, and exercised it under another name. By an act which passed in 1559, "The supremacy was again annexed to the crown, and declared that the authority of visiting, correcting, and reforming all things in the church is for ever annexed to the regal dignity, and whosoever should refuse to swear and acknowledge the queen to be the supreme governor in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within her dominions, was to forfeit any office he had either in church or state; and to be thenceforth disabled to hold any employment during life†." This is what the queen's scruple ended in; and all she did to moderate the laws of Henry VIII., with regard to the king's supremacy, was, that whereas denying the supremacy in king

---

* Burnet, l. iii. p. 386.

† Ibid. l. pp. iii. 385, 386.

Henry's time, cost men their lives, in Elizabeth's it cost them but a forfeiture of their goods*.

12.—*Resolution of the Catholic bishops.*

The Catholic bishops on this occasion were not forgetful of their duty, and being inflexibly attached to the Catholic Church and Holy See, were deposed for having constantly refused to subscribe the queen's supremacy, no less than the other articles of the Reformation. But Parker, the protestant archbishop of Canterbury, was of all the most zealous in submitting to the yoke. It was to him complaints were addressed of the queen's scruples respecting her title of Supreme head; to him was rendered an account of what was done to engage the Catholics to acknowledge it, and finally the English Reformation could no longer be compatible with the liberty and authority which Jesus Christ had given to his Church. What had been resolved on in the parliament in 1559, in favour of the queen's supremacy, was received in the synod of London by the common consent of all the clergy, of the first as well as of the second order.

13.—*Declaration of the Clergy regarding the Supremacy of Elizabeth.*

There the supremacy was inserted among the articles of faith in these terms:—"The royal majesty has sovereign power in this kingdom of England, and in her other dominions, and the sovereign government of all her subjects lay and ecclesiastical, belongs to her in all matters, without being subjected to any foreign power†" By these last words they intended to exclude the Pope; but as the other words, "in all matters‡," put in without restriction, as had been done in the act of parliament, imported a full sovereignty, even in ecclesiastical causes, without excepting those of faith, they were ashamed of proceeding to such great excess, and introduced the following modification. "Whereas we attribute to the royal majesty this sovereign government, at which we learn that many ill-disposed individuals are displeased, we do not grant to our kings the administration of the word and of the sacraments, as is clearly shewn by the ordinances of our queen Elizabeth; but we merely give to her the prerogative, which the Scripture attributes to pious princes, of being able to keep to their duty all orders, whether lay or ecclesiastical, and to check the stubborn by the sword of the civil power.

---

* Burnet, l. iii. 386. † Syn. Lond. art. 7. ‡ Syn. gen. p. i. pag. 107.

14.—*This served but as a clumsy palliation for a great evil.*

This explanation is conformable to a declaration which the queen had published, where she said at first "that she was far from wishing to administer holy things." The Protestants, ready to afford satisfaction on the subject of ecclesiastical authority, thought thereby to be sheltered from whatever evil its supremacy was attended with, but all in vain; for the question was not whether the English invested royalty with the administration of the word and of the sacraments. Who has ever accused them of wishing that their kings should ascend the pulpit, or administer communion and baptism? And what is there so uncommon in this declaration, wherein queen Elizabeth avows that this ministry appertains not to her? The question was to know, whether in such matters the royal majesty has a mere direction and an external execution, or whether it influences fundamentally the validity of ecclesiastical acts. But whilst it was apparently reduced in this article to the mere execution, the contrary appeared but too manifest in practice. Permission to preach was granted by letters patent and under the great seal. The queen made bishops with the same authority, as the king her father and the king her brother, and for a limited time if she pleased. The commission for their consecration emanated from the royal power. Excommunications were decreed by the same authority. The queen regulated by her edicts not only the exterior worship, but also faith and the dogma, or caused them to be regulated by her parliament, whose acts received their validity from her; and there is nothing more unheard of in the Christian Church, than what was done at that time.

15.—*The Parliament continues to assume the decision in points of faith.*

The parliament pronounced directly on heresy. It regulated the conditions on which a doctrine should pass for heretical, and where these conditions were not found in this doctrine, it prohibited its condemnation, "and reserved to itself the cognizance of it." The question is not to know whether the rule which parliament prescribed is good or bad; but whether the parliament, a secular body, whose acts received their validity from the prince, can decide on matters of faith, and reserve to itself the cognizance of them; that is, whether they may challenge it to themselves, and take away the exercise of it from the bishops, on whom Christ had bestowed it; for the parliament's saying they would judge with the assent of the clergy in their convocation*, was nothing but a sham; since, in the end, this was still reserving to the parliament the supreme authority, and hearing the pastors rather as counsellors whose lights they borrowed, than as natural judges, to whom only the decision appertained of divine right. I cannot think a christian heart can hear of such an invasion of the pastoral authority and the rights of the sanctuary without a sigh.

16.—*On what is grounded the Validity of the English Ordinations.*

But lest it should be imagined, that all these attempts of the secular authority on the rights of the sanctuary were nothing but usurpations of the laity, the clergy not consenting to them, and this under pretext of the above explanation given by the said clergy to the Queen's supremacy in the thirty-seventh article of the Confession of Faith, what precedes, and what follows, evince the contrary. What precedes, inasmuch as this synod being composed, as just observed, of both houses of the clergy intending to set forth the validity of the ordination of bishops, of priests, and deacons, grounds it on a form contained in the book of consecration of archbishops and bishops, and ordaining of priests and deacons, lately set forth in the time of King Edward VI., and confirmed by authority of parliament†. Weak bishops! wretched clergy! who choose rather to take the form of their ordination from a book made lately, but ten years ago in King Edward's time, and confirmed by the authority of parliament, than from the sacramentary of St. Gregory, the author of their conversion, wherein they might still read the form, according to which their predecessors and the holy monk of St. Augustin, their first apostle, had been consecrated; although this book was warranted, not indeed by the authority of parliaments, but by the universal tradition of all Christian churches‡.

17.—*Sequel of this Matter.*

Upon this it was that these bishops founded the validity of their consecration, and the orders of their priests and deacons; and this was done pursuant to a decree of parliament in 1559, wherein the doubt concerning ordination was solved by an act authorising the book of ordination, which was joined to King

---

* Syn. gen. pag. i. 107. † Syn. Lon., art. 36. Syn. Gen. p. 107. Bur. 385. ‡ Ibid.

Edward's liturgy: so that had not the parliament made these acts, the ordinations of their whole clergy had still remained dubious *.

18.—*Decisions of Faith reserved to the Authority Royal, by the Declaration of the Bishops.*

The bishops and their clergy, who had thus enslaved the ecclesiastical authority, conclude in a manner corresponding to such a beginning; when, after having set forth their faith in all the foregoing articles to the number of thirty-nine, they conclude with this ratification, wherein they declare, "That these articles being authorized by the consent and assent of Queen Elizabeth, ought to be received and executed throughout the whole realm of England." Where we find the Queen's approbation, and not only her consent by submission, but also her assent, as I may say, by express deliberation, mentioned in the act as a condition that makes it valid; insomuch that the decrees of bishops in matters the most within the verge of their ministry, receive their last form and validity, in the same style with acts of parliament from the Queen's approbation, these weak bishops never daring all this while to remonstrate, after the example of all past ages, that their decrees, valid of themselves, and by that sacred authority, which Jesus Christ had annexed to their character, required nothing else from the regal power, but an entire submission and exterior protection. Thus, whilst they forget the primitive institutions of their church, together with the head whom Jesus Christ had given them, and set up princes for their heads whom Jesus Christ had not appointed for that end, they degraded themselves to that degree, that no ecclesiastical act, not even those which regard preaching, censures, liturgy, sacraments, nay, faith itself, have any force in England, but inasmuch as they are approved and made valid by Kings; which in the main gives to Kings more than the word, and more than the administration of the sacraments, since it renders them the sovereign arbiters of one and the other.

19.—*The same Doctrine in Scotland.*—1568.

It is for the same reason that we behold the first Confession of Scotland, since she became Protestant, published in the name of the parliament; and a second Confession of the same kingdom, bearing this title: "A general Confession of the true Christian Faith according to the word of God, and the acts of our Parliaments †."

---

* Burn. ibid. p. 392.

† Synt. Gen. part i. p. 109. Ibid. p. 126. 1588.

A great multitude of different declarations was requisite to explain how these acts did not attribute the episcopal jurisdiction to the crown: but all was nothing but mere words, since after all, it still stands incontestable that no ecclesiastical act hath any force in that kingdom, no more than in England, unless ratified by the King and parliament,

20.—*The English Doctrine, which makes the King head of the Church, condemned by the Calvinists.*

Our Calvinists, I own, seem far remote from this doctrine; and I find, not only in Calvin, as already observed, but also in the national synods, express condemnations of those who confound the civil government with that of the church, by making the magistrate head of the church, or by subjecting the ecclesiastical government to the people*. But there is nothing but will go down with these men, provided you are an enemy to the Pope and Rome; insomuch that, by stress of equivocations and explanations, the Calvinists were gained, and brought in England even to subscribe the supremacy.

21.—*All that remained to the Church seized upon.*

It appears by the whole tenor of the acts which I have reported, how vain it is to pretend that, in the reign of Elizabeth, this supremacy was reduced to more reasonable terms than in the precedent reigns, there being, on the contrary, no alteration to be found in the main†. Among other fruits of the supremacy, one was the Queen's invading the revenues of the church under the pretence of giving the full value of them‡, even those of the bishops, such as, till then, had remained sacred and inviolate. Treading in the steps of the King her father, in order to engage the nobility in the interests of the supremacy and reformation, she made them a present of a share in these consecrated goods; and this state of the church, enslaved both in her temporals and spirituals, is called the English reformation, the re-establishment of evangelical purity!

22.—*A remarkable passage in Mr. Burnet, concerning the English Reformation.*

Nevertheless, if we may form a judgment of this reformation according to the gospel-rule, by its fruits, there was never any thing more deplorable: seeing the effect which this miserable subjection of the clergy did produce, was, that from thenceforwards religion was no more than a state-engine always veering at the breath of the prince. Edward's reformation, which had entirely changed that of Henry VIII., was changed itself in an instant under Mary, and Elizabeth destroyed in two years all that Mary had done before.

---

* Syn. of Paris, 1565. Syn. of Rochelle, 1571.

† Burn. l. iii. 391, &c.

‡ Thuan. lib. xxi. 1559. Burn. lib. iii. p. 391.

The bishops, reduced to fourteen in number, stood firm, together with about fifty or sixty ecclesiastics *; but, excepting so small a number in so great a kingdom, all the rest paid obedience to the Queen's injunctions, yet with so little good will for the new doctrine they were made to embrace, "that probably," says Mr. Burnet, "if Queen Elizabeth had not lived long, and a prince of another religion had succeeded before the death of all that generation, they had turned about again to the old superstitions as nimbly as they had done in Queen Mary's time †."

23.—*Inamissibility of Justice rejected by the Church of England.*

In this same Confession of Faith, which had been confirmed under Elizabeth in 1562, there are two important points relating to justification. In one of them, the inamissibility of justice is rejected clearly enough by this declaration. "After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and arise again, and amend our lives ‡." In the other, the certainty of predestination seems quite excluded, when, after saying that "The doctrine of predestination is full of comfort to godly persons, by confirming their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Jesus Christ," they add, "It is the downfal for carnal persons either into a desperation, or into recklessness of most unclean living." And, in conclusion, that "we must receive God's promises, as they be generally set forth to us in holy scripture; and in our doings, that will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God;" which seems to exclude that special certainty, whereby each of the faithful is obliged to believe in particular, as of faith, that he is in the number of the elect, and comprehended within that absolute decree, by which God wills their salvation: a doctrine not agreeable, it seems, to the Protestants of England, although they not only bear with it in the Calvinists, but also the deputies from their church have confirmed it, as we shall see in the synod of Dort [*].

---

* Burnet, l. iii. p. 401. † Ibid.

‡ Synt. Gen. part i. Conf. Aug. Art. xvi. xvii. p. 102.

24.—*The beginning of the disturbances in France fomented by Elizabeth.—Change of the Calvinian Doctrine.*

Queen Elizabeth secretly encouraged that disposition which those of France were in towards a rebellion; nearly at the same time that the English reformation was modelled under that queen, they declared themselves. Our reformed, after about thirty years, grew weary of deriving their glory from their sufferings; their patience could hold out no longer; nor did they from that time exaggerate their submission to our kings [†]. This submission lasted but whilst they were in a capacity of curbing them. Under the strong reigns of Francis I. and Henry II. they were in reality very submissive, and made no shew of an intention to levy war. The reign no less weak than short of Francis II. inspired them with boldness. The fire, so long concealed, blazed forth in the conspiracy of Amboise. Yet a sufficient strength still remained in the government to have quenched it at the beginning: but during the minority of Charles IX., and under the regency of a Queen, all whose policy aspired no further than to maintain her power by dangerous and trimming measures, the revolt became entire and the conflagration universal over all France. A particular account of these intrigues and wars comes not within my sphere, nor should I even have spoken of these commotions, if, contrary to all preceding declarations and protestations, they had not produced this new doctrine in the reformation, that it is lawful to take up arms against prince and country, in the cause of religion.

25.—*The Calvinists took arms from maxims of Religion.*

It had been well foreseen, that the new reformed would not be slack in proceeding to such measures. Not to trace back the wars of the Albigenses, the seditions of the Wickliffites in England, the furies of the Taborites in Bohemia, it had been but too apparent what was the result of all the fine protestations of the Lutherans in Germany [‡]. The leagues and wars so much detested at first, as soon as ever the Protestants were sensible of their strength, became lawful, and Luther added this new article to his gospel. The ministers too of the Vaudois had but just taught this doctrine, when the war was commenced in the valleys against their sovereigns the Dukes of Savoy. The new reformed of France were not backward to follow these examples, nor is there any doubt but they were spirited up to it by their doctors.

---

[*] Book xiv.

[†] Burn. l. iii. pp. 415, 416.

[‡] Thuan. lib. xxvii. 1560, t. ii. p. 17. La Poplin. l. vii. pp. 246, 255.

26.—*Beza owns that the conspiracy of Amboise was entered upon from a maxim of Conscience.*

As for the conspiracy of Amboise, all historians testify as much; even Beza owns it in his ecclesiastical history. It was from the influence of their doctors, that the Prince of Conde believed himself innocent, or affected to believe it, although so heinous an attempt had been undertaken by his orders*. It was resolved on by the party, to furnish him with men and money, to the end he might have a competent force: so that the design then on foot, after the seizure of the two Guises in the very castle of Amboise, where the King was in person, and forcibly carrying them away, was nothing less than from that very time to light up the torch of civil war throughout the whole kingdom. The whole body of the Reformation came into this design, and on this occasion the province of Xaintonge is praised by Beza, for having done their duty like the rest†. The same Beza testifies an extreme regret, that so just an enterprise should have failed, and attributes the bad success of it to the perfidiousness of certain people.

27.—*Four demonstrations that the riot of Amboise was the handy work of Protestants, and that the motive to it was Religion. First demonstration.*

The Protestants, it is true, were desirous of giving to this enterprise, as they do to all others of this nature, a pretext of public good, in order to inveigle some Catholics into it, and to screen the reformation from the infamy of so wicked an attempt. But four reasons demonstrate that it was in reality an affair of religion, and an enterprise carried on by the reformed. In the first place, because it was set on foot occasionally from the executions of some of the party, and especially of Anne du Bourg, that famous pretended martyr. Beza, after relating this execution, together with the other evil treatments the Lutherans underwent (then all the reformed were so called), introduces the history of this conspiracy, and at the head of the motives which gave birth to it, places these manifestly tyrannical ways of proceeding, and the menaces that on this occasion were levelled at the greatest men of the kingdom, such as the Prince of Condé and the Chastillons. "Then it was," says he, "that many lords awaked as from a profound sleep: so much the more," continues this historian, "as they considered, that the kings Francis and Henry never would attempt any thing against the men of quality, contenting themselves with aweing the great ones by the correction of the meaner sort, that now quite different measures were taken; whereas, in consideration of the number concerned, they should have applied less violent remedies, rather than thus open a gate to a million of seditions."

---

* Thuan. t. i. l. xxiv. p. 752. La Poplin. livre vi. Bez. Hist. Eccl. livre iii. p. 250. 254. 270.—1560.

† Ibid. 313.

28.—*Second Demonstration, wherein the advice of Beza and the Divines of the Party is reported.*

The confession is sincere, I must own. Whilst nothing but the dregs of the people were punished, the lords of the party did not stir, but let them go quietly to execution. When they, like the rest, were threatened, they bethought themselves of their weapons, or, as the author expresses it, "Each man was forced to look at home, and many began to range themselves together, to provide for a just defence, and to re-settle the ancient and lawful government of the kingdom." This last word was necessary to disguise the rest; but what goes before shews plainly enough the design in hand, and the sequel evinces it still more clearly. For these means of a just defence imported, that the thing* "having been proposed to lawyers and men of renown in France and Germany, as likewise to the most learned divines; it was discovered that they might lawfully oppose the government usurped by the Guises, and take up arms, in case of need, to repel their violence, provided the princes of the blood, who in such cases are born lawful magistrates, or one of them, would but undertake it, especially at the request of the estates of France, or of the most sound part thereof." Here then is a second demonstration against the new Reformation, because the divines whom they consulted, were Protestants, as it is expressly specified by Thuanus†, with them an unexceptionable author. And Beza insinuates it plainly enough, when he says, they took the advice "of the most learned divines," who, in his judgment, could be none else but the reformed. As much may we believe in regard to the lawyers, no Catholic having ever been so much as named.

---

* Beza, Hist. Eccl. liv. iii. 249.

† Lib. xxiv. p. 372, edit. Gen.

29.—*Third Demonstration.*

A third demonstration, arising from the same words is, that these princes of the blood, " born magistrates in this affair," were reduced to the sole Prince of Condé, a declared Protestant, although there were five or six more at the least, and amongst others, the King of Navarre, the prince's elder brother, and first prince of the blood ; but whom the party feared rather than depended on ; a circumstance that leaves not the least doubt that the design of the new Reformation was to command the enterprise.

30.—*Fourth Demonstration.*

Nay, not only the prince is the sole person placed at the head of the whole party, but what makes the fourth and last conviction against the Reformation is, that this, " the most sound part of the Estates, whose concurrence was demanded, were almost all reformed*." The most important and the most special orders were addressed to them, and the enterprise regarded them alone ; for the end they proposed to themselves therein was, as Beza owns, that " a confession of faith might be presented to the king assisted by a good and lawful council†." It is plain enough, this council would never have been good and lawful, unless the Prince of Condé, with his party, had governed it, and the reformed obtained all they desired. The action was to begin by a request they would have presented to the king for obtaining liberty of conscience ; and he who managed the whole affair, was La Renaudie, a man condemned to rigorous penalties for forgery, by a decree in parliament, at which court he sued for a benefice; after this, sheltering himself at Geneva, turning heretic out of spite, " burning with a desire of revenge, and of defacing, by some bold action, the infamy of his condemnation‡," he undertook to stir up to rebellion, as many disaffected persons as he could meet with ; and at last, retiring into the house of a Huguenot lawyer at Paris, had the direction of all matters in conjunction with Antony Chandieu, the Protestant minister of Paris, who afterwards gave himself the name of Sadael.

---

* La Poplin. Ibid. p. 164., &c.

† Hist. Eccl. l. iii. p. 313.

‡ Thuan. Ibid. pp. 733, 738.

31.—*The Huguenots that discovered the conspiracy do not justify the party.*

True it is, the Huguenot lawyer, with whom he lodged, and Ligueres, another Huguenot, had a horror of so atrocious a crime, and discovered the plot; but that does not excuse the Reformation, but shews only there were some particular men in the sect, whose conscience was better than that of the divines and ministers, and that of Beza himself and the whole body of the party*, who ran headlong into the conspiracy over all the provinces of the realm. Accordingly, we have seen the same Beza accusing of perfidiousness these two faithful subjects, who alone, of all the party, had an abhorrence of, and discovered, the plot; so that, in the judgment of the ministers, those that came into this black conspiracy are the honest men, and those who detected it are the traitors.

32.—*The protestation of the Conspirators does not justify them.*

It is to no purpose to say, that La Renaudie and all the conspirators protested they had no design of attempting any thing against the king or queen, or the royal family; for is a man to be deemed innocent, because he had not formed the design of so execrable a parricide†? Was it so light a matter in a state, to call in question the king's majority, and elude the ancient laws, which had fixed it at fourteen years of age, by the joint consent of all the orders of the realm? To presume, on this pretext, to appoint him such counsel as they thought fit? To rush, armed, into his palace; to assault and force him; to ravish from this sacred asylum, and out of the king's arms, the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorrain, because the king made use of them in his counsel; to expose the whole court and the king's own person to all the violence and all the bloodshed, that so tumultuous an attack, and the darkness of the night, might produce? In a word, to fly to arms over all the kingdom, with a resolution not to lay them down, till the king should be forced into a compliance with all that they desired. Were the particular injury done to the Guises here only to come in question, what right had the prince of Condé to dispose of these princes, to deliver them up to the hands of their enemies, who, as Beza himself owns‡, made a great part of the conspirators, and to employ the sword against them, as Thuanus says*, should they not consent voluntarily to relinquish all state-affairs? What! under pretext of a particular commission, given, as Beza words it†, "To men of a well-approved and wise conduct (such as La Renaudie) in order to inquire secretly, yet, though thoroughly and exactly, into all the employments heaped upon the Guises," shall a prince of the blood, of his private authority, hold them as legally convicted, and put them in the power of those, whom he knows to be "spurred on with the spirit of revenge for outrages received from them, as well in their own persons, as those of their kindred and relations;" for these are Beza's words‡. What becomes of society, if such wicked attempts be allowed? But what becomes of royalty, if men dare to execute them, sword in hand, in the king's own palace, seize on his ministers, and tear them from his side; put him under tuition; his sacred person in the power of rebels, who would have possessed themselves of his castle, and upheld such a treason, with a war set on foot over all the kingdom? This is the fruit resulting from the counsels "of the most learned Protestant divines and lawyers, of the best renown." This is what Beza approves, and what Protestants defend even to this day§.

---

* Beza. Thuan. La Poplin. Ibid. S. n. 26. 1.

† Ord. de Charles V. 1373 and 74, et seq. Vid. la Poplin. l. vi. 155 et seq.

‡ Beza, p. 250.

33.—*The suppleness and connivance of Calvin.*

Calvin is cited‖, who, after the contrivance had miscarried, wrote two letters, wherein he testifies, he had never approved it. But, after having had notice of a conspiracy of this nature, is it enough to blame it, without giving himself any further concern to stop the progress of so flagitious an undertaking? Had Beza believed that Calvin did as much detest this deed as it deserved, would he have approved it himself; would he have boasted to us the approbation of the most learned divines of the party? Who does not, therefore, perceive, that Calvin acted here too remissly; and provided he could exculpate himself, in case of ill success, was nowise averse to the conspirators hazarding the event? If we believe Brantome, the Admiral¶ was much better disposed; and the Protestant writers vapour much at what he wrote in the life of this nobleman, viz., "That none durst ever speak to him about this enterprise, because they held him for a man of probity, a man of worth, a lover of honour, who accordingly would have sent back the conspirators well rebuked, and detected the whole; nay, would himself have been aiding to quell them*." Still, however, the thing was done, and the historians of the party relate with complacency, what ought not to be mentioned but with horror.

---

* Thuan., pp. 732, 738.

† Beza, p. 250.

‡ Beza, Ibid.

§ Burn. l. iii. p. 415.

‖ Crit. de Maimb. t. i. Lett. xv. N. 6. p. 263. Cal. Ep. p. 312, 313.

¶ Crit. de Maimb. Lett. ii. N. 2.

34.—*Reflections on the uncertainty of histories useless on this occasion.*

There is no room here for eluding a certain fact, by descanting on the uncertainty of histories, and the partiality of historians†. These commonplace topics are only fit to raise a mist. Should our reformed arraign the credit of Thuanus, whose works they printed at Geneva, and whose authority, we have been lately told by a Protestant historian, none ever disputed; they have but to read La Popliniere, one of their own, and Beza, one of their chiefs, to find their party convicted of a crime, which the Admiral, Protestant as he was, judged so unworthy a man of honour.

35.—*The first wars under Charles XI. in which all the party concurred.*—1562.

Yet this great man of honour, who had such an abhorrence of the conspiracy of Amboise, either because it did not succeed, or because the measures were ill concerted, or because he found open war more to his advantage, made no scruple, two years after, of putting himself at the head of the rebellious Calvinists. Then the whole party declared themselves. Calvin made no resistance for this time, and rebellion was the crime of all his disciples. Those whom their histories celebrate as the most moderate, only said they ought not to begin‡. However, this was their joint opinion, that to suffer themselves to be butchered, like sheep, was not the profession of men of courage; but, to be men of courage in this way, they must renounce the title of Reformers, and much more—that of Confessors of the Faith, and Martyrs; for it is not in vain that St. Paul said, after David, "We are accounted as sheep for the slaughter§;" and Jesus Christ himself: "Behold! I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves‖." I have by me Calvin's own letters, well attested, wherein, at the beginning of the troubles of France, he thinks he does enough, in writing to the Baron des Adrets, against pillaging and violence, against image-breaking, and against the depredation of shrines and church treasures, without public authority. To be satisfied, as he is, with telling the soldiers thus enrolled, " Do violence to no man, and be content with your pay*," adding nothing more; is speaking of this militia as you do of a lawful militia: and it is thus that St. John the Baptist decided in behalf of those who bore arms under their lawful princes. The doctrine, which allowed taking them up in the cause of religion, was afterwards ratified, I do not say by the ministers in particular only, but also in common by their synods, and it was necessary to proceed to this decision in order to engage in the war those Protestants, who, from a sense of the ancient principles of Christian Faith, and the submission they had so frequently promised at the beginning of the new Reformation, did not believe that a Christian should maintain the liberty of conscience otherwise than by suffering, according to the gospel, in all patience and humility. The brave and wise La Noüe, who was at first of this opinion, was drawn into a contrary sentiment and practice by the authority of the ministers and synods. The church was for that time infallible, and they yielded blindly to her authority against their own consciences.

---

* Brant. vie de l'Admiral de Chastil. † Crit. de Maimb. N. 1. 4. Burn. t. 1. Pref.
‡ La Poplin. l. viii. Beza, t. ii. l. vi. p. 5. § Rom. viii. 36. ‖ Mat. x. 16.

36.—*Decisions of the Calvinian national Synods, in approbation of taking up arms.*—1563.

Now the express decisions relating to this matter were, for the most part, made in provincial synods; but, that there be no occasion to search for them there, it will be sufficient to observe, that these decisions were preceded by the national Synod of Lyons in 1563, Art. 38, by particular facts of this import,—" That a minister of Limousin, who, in other respects, had behaved uprightly, terrified by the threats of his enemies, had writ to the queen-mother, that he never had consented to the bearing of arms, although he had consented and contributed thereto. Item, that he had promised not to preach till the king should grant him leave. Since that time, having a sense of his fault, he had made a public confession of it before all the people, on a day of celebrating the Supper, in the presence of all the ministers of the country and of all the faithful. The query is, whether he may resume his pastoral charge? the opinion is, he may: nevertheless, he shall write to him by whom he had been tempted, to notify to him his repentance, and shall intreat him to let the queen know as much, and all whomsoever this scandal to his Church might have reached; and it shall be in the breast of the Synod of Limousin to remove him to some other place, as they shall think most prudent."

---

* Luke iii. 14.

37.—*Another decision.*

It is so Christian and so heroic an act, in the new reformation, to make war against their sovereign for religion's sake, that it is made criminal in a minister to have repented of, and asked pardon for it of his queen. Reparation must be made before all the people in the most solemn acts of religion, namely, at the Supper, for respectful excuses made to the queen; and so far must the insolence be carried, as to have it declared to her in person, that this tender of respect is recalled, to the end she may be assured that, from henceforth, they will have no manner of regard for her; nay, they are not certain, after all this reparation and retracting, whether or no the scandal which this submission had caused amongst the reformed people would be quite defaced. Therefore it cannot be denied that obedience was scandalous to them: thus it is decided by a national synod. But here is, in the forty-eighth article, another decision which will not appear less wonderful: an abbot arrived to the knowledge of the Gospel, had burnt all his titles, and during six years had not suffered mass to be sung in the abby. What a Reformation! but here lies the stress of his encomium: Nay, hath always comported himself *faithfully, and borne arms for the maintenance of the Gospel.* A holy abbot, indeed, who far remote from popery, no less than from the discipline of St. Bernard and St. Benedict, would not endure either mass or vespers in his abbey, whatever might have been the founder's express injunction; and moreover, dissatisfied with those spiritual weapons which St. Paul so much recommended, yet too feeble for our warrior's courage, has generously carried arms, and drawn the sword against his prince in defence of the new Gospel. Let him be admitted to the Supper, concludes the whole national Synod, and this mystery of peace becomes the remuneration for that war he had waged against his country.

38.—*The same Doctrine perpetuated in the succeeding Synods till our days.*

This tradition of the party has been handed down to subsequent times successively; and the Synod of Alais, in 1620, return thanks to M. de Chastillon for his letter, wherein "He protested to them, that he would employ whatever was in his power, after the example of his predecessors, for the advancement of the kingdom of Jesus Christ." This was their style. The juncture of times and the affairs of Alais explain the intention of this lord; and what the Admiral de Chastillon and Dandelot, his predecessors, meant by the kingdom of Christ is well known.

39.—*What was the spirit of the Huguenots in these wars.*

The ministers, who taught this doctrine, thought to impose upon the world, by setting up that fine discipline in their troops so much commended by Thuanus. It lasted indeed about three months: after this, the soldiers, soon carried away into the most grievous excesses, thought themselves well excused, if they did but cry out, Long live the Gospel; and the Baron des Adrets, who knew full well the temper of this militia, upon his being reproached, as a Huguenot historian* relates, that after quitting them he had done nothing worthy of his first exploits, excused himself by saying, there was nothing he durst not enterprise "with a soldiery, whose pay was revenge, passion, and honour," whom "he had bereft of all hopes of pardon" by the cruelties he had engaged them in. If we believe the ministers, our Reformed are still in the same dispositions; and the most voluminous of all their writers, the author of new systems, and the interpreter of prophecies, has but lately published in print, that "The fury, at this day, those are in who have suffered violence, and *the rage* they have conceived at being forced, strengthens the love and attachment they had to truth †." This, according to the ministers, is the spirit that animates these new martyrs.

40.—*Whether the example of Catholics vindicates the Huguenots.*

It serves not the turn of our Reformed, to excuse themselves, as to the civil wars, by the examples of Catholics under Henry

---

* D. Aub. t. i. l. iii. ch. ix. pp. 155, 156.

† Jur. accompliss. des Proph. Avis à tous les Chrét. Towards the middle of his Preface or Introduction.

III. and Henry IV., since, besides the incongruity of this Jerusalem's defending herself by the authority of Tyre and Babylon, they are very sensible that the body of Catholics which detested these excesses, and remained faithful to their kings, was always great: whereas, in the Huguenot party, scarce two or three persons of note can be found that stood firm in their loyalty.

41.—*Vain pretext of Calvinists, who pretend that these wars did not properly concern Religion.*

Here again they make fresh efforts to shew that these wars were merely political, and nothing appertaining to religion. These empty pretexts deserve not refutation, nothing more being necessary for discovering the drift of these wars, than to read the treaties of peace and the edicts of pacification,—of which liberty of conscience, with some other privileges for the Protestants, was always the main import: but because, at this time, men are bent more than ever upon darkening the clearest fact, duty requires of me I should speak something on this head.

42.—*Illusions of Mr. Burnet.*

Mr. Burnet *, who hath taken in hand the defence of the conspiracy of Amboise, enters also the lists in vindication of the civil wars; but after a manner which shews plainly he is acquainted with no more of our history and laws than what he has picked up from the most ignorant and the most passionate of all Protestant authors. I forgive his mistaking that famous Triumvirate under Charles IX., for the union of the King of Navarre with the Cardinal of Lorrain, whereas, unquestionably, it was that of the Duke of Guise, of the Constable de Montmorency, and the Marshal of St. Andrew: nor should I even have thought it worth my while to have pointed out these sorts of blunders, were it not that they convict him, who fell into them, of not having so much as seen one good author. It is a thing less supportable to have taken, as he has done, the disorder of Vassi for a premeditated enterprise of the Duke of Guise, with a design to break the edicts, although Thuanus†, whose testimony he must not reject, and (except Beza, too prejudiced by passion to be credited on this occasion) even Protestant authors, aver the contrary. But to say that the regency had been given to Antony, King of Navarre; to descant, as he does, on the authority of a regent; to affirm that this prince, having outstripped his power in the revocation of the edicts, the people might join themselves to the first prince of the blood after him, namely, to the prince of Condé; to carry on this empty reasoning, and say that, after the death of the King of Navarre, the regency devolved to the prince his brother, and that the foundation of the civil wars was the refusal made to this prince "of the government, to whom it of right belonged*," is, to speak plainly of a man so positive, mixing too much passion with too much ignorance of our affairs.

---

* Part ii., l. iii. p. 415, &c.

† Thuan. l. xxix. p. 77 et seq. La Poplin., l. vii. pp. 283, 284.

43.—*His gross blunders and great ignorance of the affairs of France.*

For, in the first place, it is certain, that in the reign of Charles IX. the regency was conferred upon Catherine of Medicis by the unanimous consent of the whole kingdom, and even of the King of Navarre. Mr. Burnet's lawyers, who proved, as he pretends, "that no woman might be admitted to the regency," were ignorant of a standing custom, confirmed by many examples ever since the time of Queen Blanche and St. Lewis†. These same lawyers, according to Mr. Burnet's relation, presumed even to say, "that two and twenty was the soonest that any King of France had been ever held to be of age to assume the government, contrary to the express tenor of the ordinance of Charles the Fifth, in 1374, which has always been a standing law in the whole kingdom without any contradiction‡. To quote these lawyers, and make a law for France of their ignorant and iniquitous decisions, is erecting into a state law the pretexts of rebels.

44.—*Sequel of Mr. Burnet's Fallacies.*

Neither did the Prince of Condé ever pretend to the regency, no, not even after the death of the King his brother; and so far was he from calling in question the authority of Queen Catherine, that, on the contrary, at his rising in arms, he grounded himself on nothing but the secret orders he pretended to have received. But what deceived Mr. Burnet is, perchance, his having heard it said, that those who joined themselves to the Prince of Condé for the King's defence, who, they pretended, was a prisoner in the hands of the Guises, gave to the Prince the title of lawful Protector and Defender of the King and kingdom*. An Englishman, dazzled with the title of Protector, imagined he saw in this title, according to the usage of his country, the authority of a regent. The Prince never so much as dreamt of it, since even his elder brother, the King of Navarre, was still living; on the contrary, this empty title of Protector and Defender of the kingdom, which in France signifies just nothing, was given him on no other account but because it was very well perceived there was no lawful title that could be given him.

---

* Part 2, l. iii. p. 416.

† Vide la Poplin. l. vi. pp. 155, 156.

‡ Ibid. p. 616.

45.—*The French Calvinists extricate themselves no better out of this difficulty.*

Let us then leave Mr. Burnet, who, though a foreigner, pronounces thus peremptorily on our laws, without knowing so much as the first rudiments of them. The French give the thing a different turn, and ground themselves on some of the Queen's letters, "who begged of the Prince to preserve the mother and children, and the whole kingdom, against those who had a mind to ruin all †." But two convincing reasons leave no shelter for this vain pretext. In the first place, because the Queen, who in this manner addressed herself privately to the Prince, exceeded her power; it being agreed that the regency was conferred upon her on condition that she did nothing of consequence except in council, with the participation and by the advice of the King of Navarre, as the first Prince of the blood, and lieutenant-general, established by the consent of the Estates in all the provinces and armies during the minority. As, therefore, the King of Navarre felt that she was driving all to ruin through that restless ambition which, tormented her, of preserving her authority, and that she wholly turned on the side of the Prince and the Huguenots, the just fear he was in of their becoming masters, and lest the Queen, through despair, should at length even cast herself into their arms together with the King, made him break all the measures of this Princess. The other Princes of the blood joined with him, no less than the chief men of the kingdom and the parliament. The Duke of Guise did nothing but by the orders of this King; and the Queen so well knew she exceeded her power in what she requested of the Prince, that she never durst use any other words, in her addresses to him, than those of invitation; so that these so boasted letters are nothing else, in reality, but the anxieties of Catherine, not the lawful injunctions of a regent; so much the more (and it is the second proof) as the Queen gave ear to the Prince but for a moment, and through the vain terror she had conceived of being stripped of her authority; insomuch, that it was easily believed, says Thuanus, she would come off from this design as soon as ever she should get the better of her fears*.

---

* Thuan. l. xxix. 1562. La Poplin. l. viii.

† Critiq. du P. Maimb. Let. xvii. N. 5. p. 303. Thuan. l. xxix. An. 1552, pp. 79, 81. Thuan. l. xxvi. p. 787, &c.

‡ Thuan. ibid. p. 79.

46.—*The Calvinists convicted by Beza*†.

Accordingly, the event discovers that she entered sincerely into the measures of the King of Navarre, and thenceforward never left negotiating with the prince in order to reclaim him to his duty. Wherefore, these letters of the Queen, and all that followed thereupon, are counted nothing by historians but a vain pretext. Nay, Beza makes it plain enough that all turned on religion, on the breach of edicts, and on the pretended murder of Vassi‡. The Prince neither stirred, nor gave orders to the Admiral to take up arms, but "requested, and more than entreated, by those *of the new religion* to grant them his protection, under the name and authority of the King and his edicts."

47.—*The first War resolved upon by the advice of all the Ministers, and the peace concluded notwithstanding their opposition.—Testimony of Beza.*

It was in an assembly, at which were present the chief men of their church, that the question was proposed, whether they might in conscience execute justice on the Duke of Guise, and that with no great hazard, for thus the case was worded; and the answer returned was, that "it was better to suffer what might please God, putting themselves only on the defensive, should necessity reduce the churches to that point. Yet, whatever might happen, they ought not to be the first to draw the sword§." Here, then, is a point resolved in the new reformation, that they may, without scruple, make war on a lawful power, at least in their own defence. Now, they took for an assault the revocation of the edicts; so that the reformation laid it down for a certain doctrine, that she might fight for the liberty of conscience, in contradiction not only to the faith and practice of the Apostles, but also to the solemn protestation Beza had but just made at his demanding justice of the King of Navarre; viz., "that it appertained to the church of God to suffer blows, and not to give them; but that he ought to remember, this anvil had worn out many a hammer*." This saying, so much extolled by the party, proved a deceit, since, after a while, the anvil itself commenced to strike contrary to nature, and, wearied with bearing blows, repayed them in its turn. Beza, who glories in this conceit, in another place makes this important declaration in the face of all Christendom†, "that he had warned of their *duty* as well the Prince of Condé as the Admiral, and all the other lords and men of every degree, that made profession of the Gospel, to induce them to maintain, *by all means possible to them*, the authority of the King's edicts and the innocence of the poor oppressed; and ever after hath continued in this same will, exhorting, nevertheless, every person to use his arms in the modestest manner possible, and to seek, next to God's honour, peace in all things, provided they do not suffer themselves to be deceived and imposed upon." What a delusion to persuade himself, whilst he actually authorizes a civil war, that he has fulfilled his duty by recommending modesty to a people up in arms! And as for peace, did he not see that the security he required for it would always afford pretexts, either of keeping it at a distance, or of breaking it? in the mean time he was by his preaching, as himself confesses, one of the principal inciters to the war. One of the fruits of his gospel was, to teach this new duty to subjects and officers of the crown. All the ministers concurred in his tentiments, and he owns himself‡, that when peace was mensioned, the ministers so much opposed it, that the prince, resolved on concluding it, was forced to exclude all of them from the debate; for they were determined to hinder the party from suffering the least exception to that edict, which was most favourable to them, namely that of January. But the prince, who had consented, for peace sake, to some light restrictions, "caused them to be read before the nobility, suffering none else but the gentlemen bearing arms to speak their opinions, as he declared openly in the assembly; so that the ministers, after that time, were neither heard nor admitted to give in their advice§;" by this means peace was made, and all clauses of the new edict make it appear that nothing but religion was contended for in this war. Nay it is manifest, had the ministers been hearkened to, it would have been continued in hopes of gaining more advantageous conditions which they proposed at large in writing, adding many things even to the edict of January; and they made, says Beza, a declaration of them, "to the end posterity might be informed how they comported themselves in this affair*." This, therefore, stands an external testimony, that the ministers approved the war, and were more bent than the princes and the armed soldiers themselves, on pursuing it from the sole motive of religion, which they pretend, at present, was quite out of the question; yet was the fundamental cause of the first wars, by the consent of all authors, both Catholic and Protestant.

---

* Thuan. xxvi. p. 79. † Lib. vi. ‡ Ibid. p. 4. § Ibid. p. 6.

---

* Beza, l. vi. p. 3.

† Ibid. p. 298.

‡ Ibid. pp. 280. 282.

§ Ibid. p. 285.

48.—*The other wars are destitute of all pretext.*

The rest of the wars have not so much as a colour of pretext, the queen then concurring with all the powers of the state; neither was there any other excuse alleged but discontents and contraventions; things which, in the end, have no kind of weight, but in presupposing this error, that subjects have a right in the cause of religion to take up arms against their king, although religion prescribes nothing but to suffer and obey.

49.—*Answers of Mr. Jurieu.*

I now leave the Calvinists to examine whether there be the least appearance of solidity in all Mr. Jurieu's discourses, where he says, that this same is a quarrel "wherein religion came in merely by chance, and to serve for a pretext only †;" since, on the contrary, it is manifest, religion was at the bottom of it, and the reformation of the government was nothing but a cloak to cover their shame for having begun a war of religion, after so many protestations how much they abhorred all such conspiracies.

But here is another kind of excuse which this artful minister prepares for his party as to the conspiracy of Amboise, when he answers, that, "be it as it will, it is no otherwise criminal than by the gospel rules ‡. It is then a trifle for Reformers who boast nought to us but the gospel, to form a conspiracy that is condemned by the gospel; nor will they be much concerned, provided it only militates against these sacred ordinances. But what follows in Mr. Jurieu will make it evident he understands as little of morality as Christianity, since he even dares to write these words:—"The tyranny of the princes of Guise could not be overthrown without a great effusion of blood; the spirit of Christianity suffers not that: but if this enterprise be scanned according to the rules of worldly morality, it is not at all criminal*." It was, nevertheless, according to the rules of worldly morality, that the Admiral condemned the conspiracy as so shameful and detestable, and, according to the dictates of a man of honour, not barely of a Christian, that he conceived such a horror of it; nor is the corruption of the world as yet advanced so far as to discover innocence in deeds equally subversive of all laws human and divine.

---

* Beza, l. vi. p. 285.

† Apol. pour la Reform., part 1. ch. x. p. 301.

‡ Ibid. ch. xv. p. 453.

The minister succeeds no better in his design when, instead of vindicating his pretended Reformers in their rebellions, he sets himself to point out the corruption of the court against which they rebelled, as if reformers could have been ignorant of that apostolical command, "Obey your masters, though they be froward†."

His long recriminations, with which he fills a volume, are not a whit more to the purpose, since this the main question will always return, whether those who are boasted of to us as the reformers of mankind, have diminished or increased its evils, and whether they are to be considered as Reformers who correct them, or rather as scourges whom God sends to punish them.

50.—*Question concerning the spirit of the Reformation,—Whether it was a spirit of meekness or of violence.*—1514.

Here might that question be considered, whether it be true that the Reformation, as she boasts, never aimed at establishing herself by force; but the doubt is easily resolved by all the abovementioned facts. As long as the Reformation was weak, it is true she always seemed submissive; nay, gave out for a fundamental point of her religion that she believed it not only unlawful to use force, but even to repel it‡. But it was soon discovered this was of that kind of modesty which fear inspires, a fire hid in ashes; for no sooner could the Reformation attain to be uppermost in any kingdom, but she was for ruling uncontrolled. In the first place, no security there for priests and bishops; secondly, the true Catholics were proscribed, banished, deprived of their goods, and in some places of life, by the law of the state, as for instance, in Swedeland. The fact is certain, whatever may have been said to the contrary. This was what they came to who at first cried so loud against violence; and there needs but to consider the acrimony, the bitterness, and insolence which was diffused through the first books and the first sermons of these Reformed; their bloody invectives, the calumnies they blackened our doctrine with, the sacrileges, the impieties, the idolatries with which they incessantly reproached us; the hatred they inspired against us, the plunderings which were the result of their first preaching, "the spite and violence[*]" which appeared in their seditious libels set up against the Mass; in order to form a judgment what was to be expected from such beginnings.

---

* Apol. pour la Reform., part 1. ch. xv. p. 453.

† 1 Pet. ii. 18.

‡ Crit. t. i. Let. viii., N. 1., p. 129, et seq. Let. xvi., N. 9, p. 315, &c.

51.—*Sequel of the violent spirit which predominated in the Reformation.*

But many wise men, say they, condemned these libels[†]; so much the worse for the Protestant party, whose transports were so extreme, that all the wise men who remained in it could not repress them. These libels were spread all over Paris, posted up and dispersed in every street; fixed even to the door of the king's chamber[‡]; nor did the wise ones who disapproved this, use any efficacious measures for its prevention. When that pretended martyr, Anne du Bourg, had declared in the tone of a prophet to the president Minard, whom he challenged, that in spite of his refusing to absent himself and decline hearing his cause, he never should sit judge in it[§], the Protestants knew full well how to make good his prophecy, and accordingly the president was murdered towards the evening on entering his house. It was known afterwards, that Le Maitre and St. André, both of them very averse to the new gospel, would have met with the like fate, had they come to the court; so dangerous a thing it is to offend the Reformation, though weak! And we learn from Beza himself, that Stuart, a relation of the queen's, "a man ready for any execution, and a most zealous Protestant, made frequent visits to the prisoners held in the parliament jail on the score of religion[||]." He could not be convicted of having struck the blow, yet we see at least through what channel the communication might flow; and, howsoever that may be, neither did the party want men of desperate resolution; nor can any be accused of this combination, but those who interested themselves for Anne du Bourg. It is no hard matter to vent prophecies, when such angels are at hand to execute them. The assurance of Anne du Bourg in foretelling so distinctly what was to happen, discovers plainly the good intelligence he had received; and what is said in the history of Thuanus, in order to shew him a prophet, rather than an accomplice of such a crime, smells rank of an addition from Geneva. We must not, therefore, wonder, that a party which nursed such daring spirits, should take off the mask as soon as ever a weak reign opened a prospect of success, which we have seen they never failed to do.

---

[*] Beza, l. i., p. 16.

[†] Ibid.

[‡] Thuan. lib. xxiii. An. 1559, p. 169.

[§] Beza, l. i. La Poplin. l. v. p. 144.

[||] L. iii. p. 248, An. 1560.

52.—*Vain Excuses.*

A new Defender of the Reformation is persuaded, from the dissolute behaviour, and entire conduct of the Prince of Condé, that there was "more of ambition than religion in what he did;" and he owns, that religion "was of no other use to him, than to furnish him with instruments of revenge*." He thinks by that means to resolve all into policy, and justify his own religion: not reflecting this is the very thing we charge them with, viz. that a religion styling itself reformed, was so prompt an instrument of revenge to an ambitious prince. It is nevertheless the crime of the whole party. But what does this author say to us of the pillaging of churches and vestries, of breaking down images and altars? Why truly he thinks to clear all by saying that "the prince, neither by prayers, nor by remonstrances, nor even by chastisements, could put a stop to these disorders†." This is no manner of excuse; it is a conviction of that violence, which reigned in the party, whose fury the very heads could not restrain. But I am very much afraid that they acted by the same spirit with Cranmer and the rest of the English reformers, who, upon the complaints that were made against image-breakers, "although they had a mind to check the heat of the people and keep it within compass, yet were unwilling it should be done after such a manner as to dishearten their friends too much‡." This was the case of the chief leaders of our Calvinists, who, though they judged themselves obliged in honour to blame these enormities, yet we do not find they ever did justice on the authors of them. Beza's history will suffice to shew, that our Reformed were always ready at the least signal to run to arms, to break open prisons, to seize on churches, nor was there any thing ever seen more factious. Who is ignorant of the cruelties exercised by the Queen of Navarre against priests and religious? The towers from which the Catholics were cast headlong, and the deep pits they were flung into, are shewn to this day. The wells of the bishop's palace at Nismes, and the cruel instruments employed to force them to the Protestant sermon, are not less known to the whole world. We have still the informations and decrees, by which it appears that these bloody executions were the deliberate resolves of Protestants in council assembled. We have the original orders of generals, and those of cities, at the request of consistories, to compel the Papists to embrace the Reformation, by taxes, by quartering soldiers upon them, by demolishing their houses, and uncovering the roofs. Those who withdrew, to escape these violences, were stripped of their goods: the records of the town-houses of Nismes, Montauban, Alais, Montpellier, and other cities of the party, are full of such decrees; nor should I mention them, were it not for the complaints with which our fugitives alarm all Europe. These are the men who boast their meekness. What a cruelty to persecute such people merely for religion, who warrant all they do from Scripture, and chant so harmoniously their psalms in rhyme! No fear, they soon found means to shelter themselves from martyrdom, after the example of their doctors, who always were in security themselves whilst they encouraged others; both Luther and Melancthon, Bucer and Zuinglius, Calvin and Œcolampadius, with all the rest of them, speedily betook themselves to secure sanctuaries; nor am I acquainted, amongst the heads of the reformers, with any, even false martyrs, unless perchance such a one as Cranmer, whom we have seen, after a repeated abjuration of his faith, unresolved to die in the profession of it, till he was convinced his renouncing it would be unavailable to save his life.

---

* Crit., t. i. Lett. ii. N. 3. p. 45 et seq. Ibid. Lett. xviii. p. 331.

† Ibid. Lett. xvii. N. 8.

‡ Burn. part. ii., l. i. p. 9.

53.—*Answer to those who might say, this is foreign to our subject.*

But to what purpose, it may be objected, the reflecting on these past transactions, which a peevish minister will say is only done to exasperate them the more, and aggravate their misfortunes? Such fears ought not to hinder me from relating what appertains so manifestly to my subject; and all that equitable Protestants can, in a history, require from me is, that, not relying wholly on the credit of their adversaries, I also give ear to their own historians. I do more than this, and, not content with hearing them, I join issue with them on their evidence. Let our brethren open then their eyes; let them cast them on the ancient Church, which, during so many ages of so cruel a persecution, never flew out, not for a moment, nor in one single person; but was seen as submissive under Dioclesian, nay, under Julian the apostate, when she was spread over all the earth, as under Nero and Domitian, when but in her infancy; there indeed appeared the finger of God truly visible. But the case is quite different, when men rebel as soon as able; and when their wars last much longer than their patience. Experience sufficiently shews us in all kinds of sects, that conceited opinion and strong prejudice can mimic fortitude, at least for a while; but maxims of Christian meekness are never in the heart, when men so readily exchange them, not only for opposite practices, but also for opposite maxims, with deliberation and by express decisions, as it is plain our Protestants have done. Here is, therefore, a true variation in their doctrine, and an effect of that perpetual instability, which cannot but fix on their Reformation a character suitable to those works, which having but what is human in them, of course must "come to nought*," according to Gamaliel's maxim.

54.—*The Assassination of the Duke of Guise, by Poltrot, held by the Reformation as an act of Religion.*—1562.

The assassination of Francis, Duke of Guise, ought not to pass unmentioned in this history, inasmuch as the author of this murder mingled his religion with his crime. It is Beza that represents to us Poltrot as excited by some secret impulse, at the time he resolved upon this infamous exploit; and in order to make us understand that this secret impulse was from God, he also describes the same Poltrot just ready to enter on the execution of this black design†, "Praying to God most ardently, that he would vouchsafe to change his will, if what he intended was displeasing to him; otherwise, that he would give him constancy, and strength sufficient to slay this tyrant, and by that means free Orleans from destruction, and the whole kingdom from so miserable a tyranny. Thereupon, and in the evening of the same day, proceeds Beza, he struck the blow; that is, during this enthusiasm, and just rising up from that ardent prayer‡." As soon as ever our Reformed knew the thing was done, "they solemnly returned thanks to God with great rejoicings§." The Duke of Guise had always been the object of their hatred. No sooner were they in a condition to effect it, but we have seen them conspire his ruin, and this by the advice of their doctors. After the riot of Vassi, although it was certain he had used all his endeavours to appease it, the party rose up against him with hideous clamours¶; and Beza, who carried their complaints to court, acknowledges, "He had desired and begged of God innumerable times, either to change the heart of the Duke of Guise, which, nevertheless, he could not hope, or that he would rid the kingdom of him; whereof he calls to witness all those who have heard his prayers and preaching*." It was therefore in this preaching, and in public, that he offered up innumerable times these seditious prayers; after the example of those of Luther, whereby, we have observed, he knew so well how to animate mankind, and stir up individuals to fulfil his prophecies. By the like prayers the Duke of Guise was represented as a hardened persecutor, from whom it was necessary to beseech God that he would deliver the world by some extraordinary stroke of his Providence. What Beza says in his own excuse †, "that he did not publicly name the Duke of Guise," is much too silly. What signifies the naming a man when you know both how to point him out by his characters, and explain yourself in particular to those who might sufficiently have understood you? These mysterious innuendos, in sermons and divine service, are more likely to exasperate men's minds, than more explicit declarations. Beza was not the only one that inveighed most bitterly against the Duke; all the ministers railed in the same manner. No wonder then, that amongst so many "men disposed for execution," with which the party abounded, some should be found that thought they did God service in delivering the Reformation from such an enemy. The still blacker enterprise of Amboise had met with the approbation of Beza and their doctors. This, in the conjuncture of the siege of Orleans, when the bulwark of the party together with this city was just falling into the Duke's hands, was of a far different importance; and Poltrot believed he did more for his religion than La Renaudie. Accordingly, he talked openly of his design as of a thing that would be well approved of. Although he was known in the party for a man sworn to kill the Duke of Guise, cost what it would, neither the generals, nor the soldiers, nor even the pastors dissuaded him from it. Let any one that pleases believe what Beza says ‡, that those words were taken "for the vagaries of a giddy-headed person," that would never have vented his design had he resolved to execute it. But the more sincere D'Aubigné is agreed, that it was hoped in the party he would strike the blow: which, he says, "he had learnt from good authority §."

---

* Acts v. 38.

† L. vi. pp. 267, 268.

‡ Ibid. p. 290.

§ Ibid. p. 290.

¶ Thuan. lib. xxix. pp. 77, 78.

---

* L. vi. 299. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 268.

§ D'Aub. p. 1. l. iii. c. xvii. p. 176.

It is also very certain, that Poltrot did not pass for one that was hair-brained[*]. Soubize, whose servant he was, and the Admiral, considered him as a useful person, and employed him in affairs of consequence; and the manner of his explaining himself spoke him rather a man resolute at all events, than one giddy-headed and crazy. " He presented himself (they are Beza's words) to Mr. Soubize, a leading man in the party, to acquaint him that he had resolved with himself in cold blood to deliver France from so many miseries, by killing the Duke of Guise; which he durst boldly undertake, *cost what it would*[†]." The answer which Soubize returned him was not calculated to make him relent in his undertaking; for he only tells him " To do his accustomed duty;" and as for the matter proposed, " God knew well how to take care of it by other means." So faint a reply, in an action which ought not to be spoken of without horror, must have discovered to Poltrot, in Soubize's mind, either the apprehension that the thing would not be executed successfully, or the design of exculpating himself, rather than an express condemnation of it. The rest of the chiefs spoke to him with no less indifference: they were satisfied with telling him " he ought to be aware of extraordinary vocations[‡]." This, instead of dissuasion, was working up a belief in him that his enterprise had something in it of what was heavenly and inspired; and, as D'Aubigné expresses it in his animated style, " Their remonstrances, under the appearance of dissuading, really urged him on." Accordingly, he was but the more determined on his black undertaking: he spoke of it to every body; and, continues Beza, " had his mind so bent on it, as to make it the common topic of his discourse." During the siege of Rouen, at which the king of Navarre was killed, this death being mentioned, Poltrot, " fetching a deep sigh from the bottom of his breast, Ha! says he, this is not enough, a much greater victim must still be sacrificed[§]." When asked what it might be: he answered, " It is the great Guise;" and at the same time, lifting up his right arm, " This is the arm," cried he, " that will do the deed, and put an end to our misfortunes." This he repeated often, and always with the like energy. All these discourses bespeak a man determined, scorning to conceal himself, because persuaded he is doing a meritorious action: but what more discovers the disposition of the whole party, is that of the Admiral, whom they held up to the whole world as a pattern of virtue and the glory of the Reformation. I shall not speak here of Poltrot's evidence, accusing him and Beza of having induced him to this design. Let us lay aside the testimony of a witness, who has perhaps varied too much to be entirely credited on his own word: but the facts avowed by Beza [*] in his history cannot be called in question, much less those that are contained in the declaration which the Admiral and he jointly, on the assassin's accusation, sent to the Queen [†]. Thence, therefore, it remains evident, that Soubize dispatched Poltrot with a packet of letters to the Admiral when still near Orleans endeavouring to relieve the town; that it was with the Admiral's consent that Poltrot went to the Duke of Guise's camp, and pretended to surrender himself to him, as one who was tired of bearing arms against the king [‡]; that the Admiral, who otherwise could not be ignorant of a design made public by Poltrot, learnt from his own mouth that he persisted in it still, since he owns that Poltrot, in departing on his enterprise, "went so far as to tell him, it would be an easy matter to kill the Duke of Guise;" that the Admiral spoke not a word to turn him from it; nay, on the contrary, though conscious of his design, gave him at one time twenty crowns, and a hundred at another, to mount himself well [§]: in those days a considerable supply, and absolutely necessary both to facilitate his undertaking and escape [||]. Nothing can be more frivolous than what the admiral alleges in his own defence. He says, "that when Poltrot mentioned to him his killing the Duke of Guise, he, the admiral, never opened his mouth to incite him to undertake it." There was no need of inciting a man, whose resolution was so well taken; and in order that he might accomplish his design, the admiral had no more to do than, as he did, to dispatch him to the place where he might execute it. The admiral, not content to send him thither, gives him money to support himself there, and for the supply of all necessaries for such a design, not forgetting even that of a good horse and furniture [¶]. What the Admiral alleged farther, that he sent Poltrot into the camp only to gain intelligence, is manifestly nothing but a cloak to that design, which he would not own. As for the money, nothing is more weak than what the admiral replies, viz. "that he gave it Poltrot, without ever specifying to him the killing or not killing the Duke of Guise [**]." But the reason he brings in his justification for not dissuading him from so wicked an attempt, discovers the bottom of his heart. He confesses then, "before these last troubles, he knew the men who had determined to kill the Duke of Guise; that far from inducing them to this design, or approving it, he had diverted them from it, and even given notice of it to Madame de Guise: that, since the affair of Vassi, he had prosecuted the Duke as a public enemy; nevertheless it cannot be discovered, that he *had approved* any attempt should be made on his person, till he had notice given him that the Duke had drawn in certain persons to kill him and the Prince of Condé." It follows, therefore, that after this notice given (as to the truth whereof we ought not to believe an enemy on his bare word) "he did approve" attempting on the Duke's life: but, "since that time, he acknowledges, when he heard one say, if he could he would kill the Duke of Guise even in his camp, he did not dissuade him from it:" by which it appears at once, that this bloody design was common in the Reformation, and the chiefs of it, the most esteemed for their virtue, such was undoubtedly the Admiral, did not think themselves under any obligation of opposing it; on the contrary, they concurred to it every the most effectual way they were able; so little did an assassination disturb their consciences, provided religion were its motive.

---

[*] Beza, pp. 268, 295, 297.

[†] Ibid. pp. 266, 268.

[‡] D'Aub. t. i. p. 176.

[§] Thuan. l. xxxiii. p. 207.

---

[*] L. vi. pp. 291, 308.
[†] Ibid. pp. 294, 295, et seq.
[‡] P. 209.
[§] P. 308.
[||] Ibid. pp. 297, 391.
[¶] Ibid.
[**] Ibid. p. 297.

55.—*Sequel.*

Should it be asked, what could induce the Admiral to confess facts which bore so hard upon him? it was not from his ignorance of the difficulties he incurred; but, says Beza *, "the Admiral, being downright and truly sincere, if any man of his quality ever was, made answer, that if afterwards, upon confronting, he should happen to make some further confession, he might give occasion to think that even then he did not discover the whole truth;" that is, if rightly understood, this sincere and downright man feared the force of truth at confronting, and prepared his subterfuges, as is usual to guilty persons, whose conscience, and fear of being convicted, makes them often confess more than could be drawn from witnesses. Nay, it seems, if the manner of the Admiral's explaining himself be well considered, that he feared men should think him innocent, that he shunned only the formal acknowledgment and a juridical conviction, and, what is more, took pleasure in displaying his revenge. But the most politic thing he did for his acquittal was desiring that Poltrot might be kept to be con-

* Beza, p. 308.

fronted with him, relying on his alleged excuses and the conjuncture of the times, which forbade driving to extremes the chief of so formidable a party*. Neither was the court ignorant of this, and accordingly the process was concluded. Poltrot, who had retracted the charge brought in by him against the Admiral and Beza, persisted in acquitting Beza, even to death †; but, as for the Admiral, he impeached him anew by three declarations, one after another, even amidst the tortures of his punishment, of having induced him to perpetrate this murder for God's service. As for Beza, it does not appear that he had any share in this action otherwise than by his seditious preaching, and the approbation he had given of the much more criminal conspiracy of Amboise; but very certain it is, that before the fact was committed, he did nothing to prevent it, although he could not be ignorant of the design, and, when it was over, omitted nothing that might give it all the appearance of an inspired action. The reader may judge of the rest; and here there is more than sufficient to make it evident what spirit those were animated with, who thus boast their meekness.

56.—*Catholics and Protestants agreed on the question of punishing Heretics.*

There is no need here of explaining myself on that question, whether or no Christian princes have a right to use the sword against their subjects, enemies to sound doctrine and the church, the Protestants being agreed with us in this point. Luther and Calvin have written books expressly to make good the right and duty of the magistrate in this point‡. Calvin reduced this to practice against Servet and Valentine Gentili§. Melancthon approved of this procedure by a letter he wrote to him on this subject||. The discipline of our reformed likewise permits recourse to the secular arm in certain cases; and amongst the articles of discipline of the Geneva church¶, it appears that the ministers ought to inform the magistrate against the incorrigible, who despise spiritual penalties, and especially against those, without distinction, who teach new doctrine. And even at this day, the author** that most bitterly of all the Calvinian writers upbraids the Roman church

---

* Beza, p. 308. † Pp. 312, 319, 327.

‡ Luth. de Magist. t. iii. § Calvin, opusc. p. 592. Ibid. 600, 659.

|| Melan. Calvino inter Calv. Ep. p. 169.

¶ Jur. Syst. ii. chap. 22, 33. Lett. Past. de la 1 Année 1, 2, 3.

** Hist. du Papis. 2. Recrim. ch. 2, *et seq.*

on this subject, with the cruelty of her doctrine, subscribes to it in the main, inasmuch as he permits the exercise of the power of the sword in matters of religion and conscience; a thing which in truth cannot be called in question without enervating, and, as it were, maiming the power of the legislature; so that there cannot be a more dangerous illusion, than to set down sufferance as a characteristic of the true church; nor do I know amongst Christians any but Socinians and Anabaptists that oppose this doctrine. In a word, the right is certain, but moderation is not less necessary.

57.—*Calvin's Death.*

Calvin died at the beginning of these troubles. It is a weakness to look for something extraordinary in the death of such men; God does not always exhibit such examples. Since he permits heresies for the trial of his elect, we ought not to wonder that, to complete this trial, he suffers the spirit of seduction, with all the fine appearances wherewith it decks itself out, to predominate in them even to the end; and without further informing myself about Calvin's life and death, it is enough that he kindled a flame in his country which the effusion of so much blood could not extinguish, and is gone to appear before God's judgment-seat without the least remorse for so great a crime.

58.—*New Confession of Faith of the Helvetic Churches.*

His death made no alteration in the affairs of the party; but the instability natural to new sects was always furnishing the world with some new spectacle, and Confessions of Faith went on at their usual rate. In Switzerland, the defenders of the figurative sense, far from being satisfied with so many confessions of faith made in France and elsewhere, in exposition of their doctrine, were not even satisfied with those that were made amongst themselves. We have seen that of Zuinglius in 1530, we have seen another published at Basil in 1532, and another of the same town in 1536; another in 1554, agreed to with the joint consent of the Switzers and those of Geneva: all these confessions of faith, although ratified by divers acts, were not deemed sufficient; and it was necessary to proceed to a fifth in 1566*.

---

* Synt. Gen. 1st part, p. 1.

59.—*The Ministers' frivolous reasons for this new Confession of Faith.*

The ministers who published it were very sensible that these alterations, in a thing of that importance, and which ought to be so firm and simple as a Confession of Faith, discredited their religion. For which reason, they set forth a preface, wherein they strove to account for this last change; and here is the whole of their defence: *viz.*, "Although many nations have already published different confessions of faith, and they themselves have also done the same thing by public writings, nevertheless, they also propose this" (reader, observe) "because those writings may perchance have been forgotten, or be spread in divers places, and explain the thing so much at large that all the world have not time to read them *." Yet, it is visible that these two first confessions of faith, which the Swiss had published, scarce take up five leaves; and another, which might be joined to them, is much about the same length; whereas, this last mentioned, which ought to be the shortest, has more than sixty. And, allowing their other confessions of faith had been forgotten, nothing was more easy than to publish them anew, were they contented with them: so that there was no necessity for publishing a fourth, but because they found themselves obliged to it for a reason they durst not utter; which was the variety of new sentiments continually rising in their minds; and as they must not own their daily loading their confessions with such novel fancies, they cloak their changes with such frivolous pretexts.

60.—*Imputed Justice begins but then to be known amongst the Swiss.*

We have seen that Zuinglius was an apostle and reformer, without so much as knowing what was that grace by which we are Christians; and he who saved even philosophers by virtue of their morality, was an entire stranger to imputed justice. Accordingly, nothing appeared of it in the Confessions of Faith of 1532 and 1536†. Grace was acknowledged there in such a manner as Catholics might have approved, had it been less indefinite; and nothing was so much as mentioned in them against the merit of works. In the convention made with Calvin in 1554, it appears that Calvinism began to gain ground; and, accordingly, imputed justice then shews itself; they had been reformed nearly forty years without knowing this fundamental article of the reformation. The thing was not thoroughly explained till 1566; and it was by such a gradation that, from Zuinglius's excesses, they passed insensibly to those of Calvin.

---

* Synt. Gen. init. Præfat.

† Conf. 1532. Art. ix. Synt. Gen. i. p. 68. 1536. Art. 2, 3. Ibid. p. 72. Consens. Art. iii. opusc. Cal. 751. Conf. fid. c. xv. Synt. Gen. part i. p. 26.

61.—*The merit of Good Works how rejected.*

In the chapter concerning good works, they speak of them in the same sense that other Protestants do, as the necessary fruits of faith, and reject their merit, whereof, we have seen, not a word was said in the precedent confessions. To condemn them, they here make use of a saying, often inculcated by St. Austin, but they quote it incorrectly; for, whereas St. Austin says, and incessantly repeats it, "That God crowns his own gifts, when he crowns our merits;" they make him say, "He crowns in us, not our merits, but his own gifts*." The difference of these two expressions is easily perceived, one of which joins the merits with the gifts, and the other separates them. It seems, nevertheless, as if they had a mind to insinuate, at the close, that they condemned merit only as opposed to grace; their conclusion running thus: "We, therefore, condemn those who so defend merit, as to deny grace." In reality, then, no error but that of the Pelagians is here condemned; for the merit, which we admit, is so little contrary to grace, that it is the very gift and fruit thereof.

62.—*Faith appropriated to the Elect.—Certainty of salvation.—Inamissibility of justice.*

In the tenth chapter, true faith is attributed to the predestinated alone, by these words: "Every man must hold it for unquestionable, that, if he believes, and abides, in Jesus Christ, he is predestinated." And a little further on, "If we communicate with Jesus Christ, and he belong to us, and we to him, by true faith, this is to us a sufficiently clear and sure testimony that we are written in the book of life†." Hence it is plain that true faith, namely, justifying faith, appertains only to the elect; that this faith and this justice can never be lost finally; and that temporary faith is not the true justifying faith. These same words seem to conclude for the absolute certainty of predestination; for, although they make it depend on faith, it is a doctrine received amongst the whole Protestant party, that a believer, in saying "I believe," feels in himself the true faith. But herein they are insensible of the seduction of our self-love, of the mixture of our passions, so strangely complicated, that our own dispositions, and the true motives which actuate us, are often what we, of all things, know with the least degree of certainty; so that, in saying with that disconsolate father in the gospel, "I believe*," how greatly soever we may think ourselves moved, though we should cry out lamentably as he did, and with a flood of tears; we ought, nevertheless, to subjoin, with him, "Lord, help thou mine unbelief;" and shew by that means, that saying "I believe," is rather an effort in us to produce so great an act, than an absolute certainty of our having produced it.

---

* Synt. Gen. part i., p. 26. † Cap. x. p. 15.

63.—*Conversion ill explained.*

How prolix soever be the discourse, which the Zuinglians make on free will, in the ninth chapter of their Confession†, this little is all that is material in it. Three states of man are well distinguished: That of his first institution, wherein he had the power of inclining to good, and declining from evil; that of his fall, when, unable to do good, he yet is free to evil, because he embraces it voluntarily, and by consequence with liberty, although God frequently prevents the effect of his choice, and hinders him from accomplishing his evil purposes; and that of his regeneration, when, reinstated by the Holy Ghost in the power of voluntarily doing good, he is free, yet not fully, on account of the infirmity of concupiscence remaining in him, acting, nevertheless, not passively; these are their terms—odd enough, I own—for what is it to act passively? And how is it possible such an idea should enter any man's head? However, this manner of speech pleased our Zuinglians. Acting (they continue to speak of man regenerated), not passively, but actively, in the choice of good, and in the operation by which he accomplishes it. How much was this short of a clear and full explanation! They ought to have joined to these three states, that of man between corruption and regeneration, when, touched with grace, he begins to bring forth the spirit of salvation amidst the pangs of repentance. This state is not that of corruption, in which he wills nought but evil, since he begins, in this state, to will good; and if the Zuinglians would not consider it as a state, it being rather a passage from one state to another, they ought to explain, at least in some other place, that, in this passage, and previously to regeneration, the effort man makes, through grace, to convert himself, is not an evil. Our Reformed are strangers to these necessary precisions; they ought also to have explained whether, in this passage, when drawn towards good by grace, we can resist it; and again, whether, in the state of corruption, we do evil so of ourselves as not to be able even to abstain from one evil rather than another; and lastly, whether in the state of regeneration, working good, through grace, we be so forcibly attracted to it, as not to have it then in our power to decline to evil. All these things were necessary to give a right understanding of the operation and even notion of free will, which these doctors leave confused by terms too indefinite and equivocal.

---

* Mark ix. 24.

† Cap. ix. p. 12.

64.—*Monstrous Doctrine on Free-Will.*

But what ends the chapter displays still better the perplexity of their thoughts. "We doubt not," say they, "that men regenerate, or not regenerate, have equally their free will in common actions; because man, being not inferior to beasts, hath that in common with them, to will certain things, reject others; thus, he may speak or hold his tongue, go out of doors, or remain within." Strange doctrine! To make us free like beasts! They have not a more elevated idea of man's liberty, having said a little before, "that, by his fall, he is not altogether changed into a log or stone*;" which is as much as to say, he wants but little of it. However that may be, the Swiss Zuinglians aim no higher; nay, the Protestants of Germany grovel still lower, when they say, that in man's conversion, to wit, in the most noble action he is capable of—in the action by which he unites himself with his God,—he acts no more than a stone or log, though he acts differently on other occasions†. How dost thou debase thyself, O man, thus meanly accounting for thy free will! But, in fine, since man is not a log, and, in ordinary actions, his free will is made to consist in being able to do certain things, or not to do them, it ought to be considered, that not finding in ourselves a different manner of acting, in natural actions, from what we do in others, this same liberty accompanies us throughout; and that God knows how to preserve it, even when he elevates us by his grace to actions supernatural—it being unworthy of His holy Spirit to make us act any more in these than in others, like to beasts, or rather, like stocks and stones.

---

* Cap. ix. pp. 12, 13.

† Concord. p. 662, § 5. S. lib. viii. n. 48.

65.—*Our Calvinists are more sparing in their explanations, and why.*

It may perhaps seem strange, that we spoke nothing of any of these matters in treating of the confession of the Calvinists. But the reason is, they themselves pass them all in silence, nor think it worth their while to speak of the manner in which man acts ; as if it were a thing indifferent to man himself, or did not appertain to faith to know, in point of liberty, together with one of the most beautiful lineaments God has traced in man, to make him in his own image, that very thing which renders us worthy of blame or praise before God and man.

66.—*The Supper without Substance, and the Presence only in virtue.*

The article of the Supper still remains, in which the Swiss will shew themselves more sincere than ever. Those indeterminate phrases, which we have seen them employ once only, in 1536, by Bucer's advice, and in condescension to the Lutherans, are no longer satisfactory to them. Even Calvin, their very good friend, cannot bring them over to the proper substance, nor the incomprehensible miracles, whereby the Holy Ghost, notwithstanding the distance of place, makes us partakers of it. They say, therefore, "that indeed we receive, not an imaginary nourishment, but the proper body, the true body of our Lord given for us, but interiorly, spiritually, by faith, the body and blood of our Lord, but spiritually by the Holy Ghost, who gives and applies to us the things which the body and blood of our Lord have merited for us, namely, the forgiveness of sins, the deliverance of our souls, and life eternal ." This is, then, what is called the thing received in this sacrament. This thing received indeed, is the forgiveness of sins, and spiritual life ; and if the body and blood are also received, it is by their benefit and effect ; or, as is afterwards subjoined, by their figure, by their commemoration, and not by their substance. For which reason, after having said, "That the body of our Lord is no where but in heaven, where he ought to be adored, and not under the species of bread [†]," in order to explain the manner in which he is present, "He is not," say they, "absent from the Supper. Though the sun be in heaven absent from us, he is present to us efficaciously, that is, present by his virtue. How much more is Jesus Christ present

---

[*] Cap. xxi. p. 48.

[†] P. 50.

to us by his vivifying operation?" Who does not perceive that what is present to us only by its virtue, has no need of communicating its proper substance? These two ideas are incompatible, nor has any man ever said seriously, that he receives the proper substance of the sun and stars, under pretext that he receives their influences. Thus Zuinglians and Calvinists, who, of all that have separated from Rome, boast most of being united among themselves, nevertheless reform each other in their several confessions of faith, and never could agree in one common and simple explanation of their doctrine.

67.—*Nothing particular in the Supper.*

True it is, that of the Zuinglians leaves nothing peculiar to the Supper. The body of Jesus Christ is no more there than in any other actions of a Christian; and it was in vain that Jesus Christ said in the Supper only, with so much energy, "This is my body;" since with these powerful words he was able to work nothing in it that is singular. This is the inevitable weak side of the figurative sense, which the Zuinglians were well aware of, and owned sincerely: "This spiritual nourishment is taken," say they, "out of the Supper; and how often soever a person believes, this believer hath already received and enjoyeth this food of everlasting life; but for the same reason, when he receives the sacrament, that which he receiveth is not nothing; non nihil accipit." What is our Lord's Supper reduced to? all they can say for it is, that what you receive in it "is next to quite nothing. For," proceed our Zuinglians, "we continue there to partake of the body and blood of our Lord." So the Supper hath nothing singular in it. "Faith is stirred up, increases, is nourished with some spiritual food; for as long as we live it receives a continual increase." It receives, therefore, as much of all this out of the Supper as in the Supper, nor is Jesus Christ a whit more there than any where else. In this manner, after saying that the particular thing received in the Supper is not a mere nothing, and in fact reducing it to so small a matter, they are not yet able to tell us what is that little they have left in it. Here is a great vacuum I must own; it was in order to supply this emptiness that Calvin and the Calvinists invented their big swelling words. They thought to fill up this frightful chasm by saying in their Catechism, that out of the Supper, Jesus Christ is received in part only; whereas, in the Supper, he is received fully. But to what purpose promising such great matters when you mean nothing by them? I like far better the sincerity of Zuinglius and the Swiss, who own the scantiness of their Supper, than the false plenty of our Calvinists, sumptuous in nothing but in words.

68.—*The Swiss the most sincere of all the defenders of the Figurative Sense.*

Thus much am I then obliged to say in behalf of the Zuinglians, that their Confession of Faith is of all the most natural and simple; and this not only with reference to the Eucharistic point, but in regard to all the others; in a word, of all the Protestant confessions of faith, that of 1566, with all its defects, speaks the most clearly what it means to speak.

69.—*Remarkable Confession of the Polonian Zuinglians, in which the Lutherans are roughly handled.*—1570.

Amongst the Polish separatists from the Church of Rome, there were some that maintained the figurative sense, and these had subscribed, in 1567, the confession of faith, which the Swiss had drawn up the year before. They rested content with it for three whole years; but in 1570, they thought it reasonable to frame another in a synod held at Czenger, which is to be met with in the collection of Geneva, in which they particularly signalize themselves on the Supper article*.

They condemn the reality, as well in respect to the delirium of Catholics, who say the bread is changed into the body, as in respect to the folly of the Lutherans, who place the body with the bread: they declare particularly against the latter, that the reality, which they admit, cannot subsist without a change of substance, such as happened in the waters of Egypt, in the wand of Moses, and in the water at the nuptial feast of Cana; thus they clearly own that transubstantiation is necessary, even by the principles of the Lutherans. They hold them in such abhorrence, as to vouchsafe them no other appellation than that of "eaters of human flesh," ascribing everywhere to them a "carnal and bloody" manner of communicating, as if they ate raw flesh†. After condemning the Papists and the Lutherans, they speak of others under error, whom they call Sacramentarians. "We reject," say they, "the phrensy of those who believe that the Supper is an empty sign of our absent Lord." By these words they aim at the

---

* Synod. Czen. Synt. Conf. part i. p. 148. Cap. de Cœn. Dom. p. 153.

† Cap. de Sacramentariis, p. 155.

Socinians, as introducers of an empty supper, though unable to shew that their own is better furnished, nothing at all being to be found in either of them with respect to the body and the blood, but signs, commemoration, and virtue*. To place some difference betwixt the Zuinglian and Socinian Supper, they say in the first place, that the Supper is not the sole memorial of Jesus Christ absent, and make an express chapter concerning the presence of Jesus Christ in this mystery. But endeavouring to expound it, they confound themselves with terms that are not of any language, words so uncouth and barbarous, as not to be translated. Jesus Christ, say they, is present in the supper both as God and man: as God, *entèr, præsentèr*; render these words who can: by his Jehoval divinity, that is, in common speech, by his divinity properly so called, and expressed by the incommunicable name, "As the vine in its branches, and the head in its members." All this is true, but nothing to the Supper, where the question relates to the body and blood. They proceed, therefore, to say, that Jesus Christ is present as man in four ways. "In the first place," say they, "by his union with the word, inasmuch as he is united to the word who is every where. Secondly, he is present in his promise by the word and by faith, communicating himself to his elect as the vine communicates itself to its branches, and the head to its members, though distant from it. Thirdly, he is present by his sacramental institution, and the infusion of his holy spirit. Fourthly, by his office of dispenser, or by his intercession for his elect." They add, "he is not present carnally, nor locally, it being requisite he should be no where corporally till the day of universal judgment, except in heaven†."

70.—*Ubiquity taught by the Polish Zuinglians.*

The three last of these four ways of presence are well enough known amongst the defenders of the figurative sense. But will they be able to make us comprehend the first, agreeably to their sentiments? have they ever taught, as the Poles of their communion do, that "Jesus Christ is present as man, in the Supper, by his union with the word, because the word is every where present?" This is the reasoning of Ubiquitarians, who attribute to Jesus Christ an omnipresence as to place, even according to his human nature; but this extravagance of the Ubiquitarians is no where maintained but amongst the Lutherans. The Zuinglians and Calvinists reject it equally with the Catholics. Yet this notion is borrowed by the Polish Zuinglians, who, not fully satisfied with the Zuinglian confession which they had subscribed, append to it this new dogma.

---

* Cap. de Sacramentariis, p. 153, 154. Cap. de Præs. in Cœnâ. p. 155.

† P. 155.

71.—*Their agreement with the Lutherans and Vaudois.*

They did more, and that very year united themselves with the Lutherans, whom they had but just condemned as gross and carnal men, as men who taught a cruel and bloody communion. They sued for their communion, and those eaters of human flesh became their brethren. The Vaudois entered into this agreement, and all, assembled together at Sendomir, subscribed what had been defined concerning the Supper-article in the confession of faith called Saxonic.

But for the better understanding of this triple union betwixt the Zuinglians, Lutherans, and Vaudois, it will be necessary to know who these Vaudois were, who then appeared in Poland. It may not be amiss to know moreover what were the Vaudois in general, they being at last turned Calvinists; and many Protestants doing them so much honour as to assert even that the Church, persecuted by the Pope, preserved her succession in this society—so gross and manifest a delusion, that I must strive once for all to cure them of it.

BOOK XI.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ALBIGENSES, THE VAUDOIS, THE WICKLIFFISTS, AND HUSSITES.

A brief Summary.—A short history of the Albigenses and Vaudois.—That they are two different Sects.—The Albigenses are complete Manicheans.—Their origin explained. The Paulicians are a branch of the Manicheans in Armenia, whence they pass into Bulgaria, thence into Italy and Germany, where they are called Cathari; and into France, where they took the name of Albigenses.—Their prodigious errors, and their hypocrisy, are discovered by all contemporary authors.—The illusions of Protestants endeavouring to excuse them.—The testimony of St. Bernard, who is wrongfully accused of credulity.—The origin of the Vaudois.—The Ministers in vain make them the disciples of Berengarius.—They believed Transubstantiation.—The seven Sacraments acknowledged by them.—Confession and sacramental Absolution.—Their error, a kind of Donatism.—They make the Sacraments depend on the holiness of their Ministers, and allow the administration of them to pious laymen.—Origin of the Sect called the Brethren of Bohemia.—That they are not Vaudois, which origin they contemn; nor the disciples of John Huss, though they boast of it.—Their deputies sent over all the world to seek for Christians of their belief, without being able to find any.—Wickliff's impious doctrine.—John Huss, who glories in being his disciple, abandons him in regard of the Eucharist.—The disciples of John Huss divided into Taborites and Calixtins.—The confusion of all these Sects.—The Protestants can draw from thence no advantage for the establishment of their Mission, and succession of their Doctrine.—The agreement of the Lutherans, of the Bohemians, and the Zuinglians in Poland.—The divisions and reconciliations of sectaries make equally against them.

1.—*What is the succession of Protestants.*

It is incredible what pains our reformed have been at, in order to find themselves predecessors in all foregoing ages. Whilst in the fourth age, of all the most illustrious, none could be found but Vigilantius alone, that opposed the honour paid to saints and the veneration of their relics, he is looked on by Protestants as the person who preserved the Depositum, namely, the succession of apostolic doctrine, and is preferred to St. Jerome, who has the whole Church on his side. For the same reason, too, Aërius ought to be considered as the only one whom God enlightened in the same century, for he alone rejected the sacrifice which every where else, in the East as well as the West, was offered for the relief of the dead. But, unluckily, he was an Arian; and they were ashamed to count amongst the witnesses of the truth, a man that denied the Divinity of the Son of God. But I am amazed they stuck at that. Claude of Turin was an Arian, and the disciple of Felix of Urgel, that is, a Nestorian into the bargain *. But because he broke Images, he finds place amongst the forefathers of the Protestants. It matters not how far soever the rest of the Iconoclasts, as well as he, have outstretched this point, even to say, that God forbade the arts of painting and sculpture; it is sufficient they taxed the rest of Christians with idolatry, to be enrolled amongst the first-rate witnesses of the truth. Berengarius impugned nothing but the Real Presence, leaving all the rest as he found it; but the rejecting of one only tenet was sufficient to make him a Calvinist, and a doctor of the true church. Wickliff will be of that number, notwithstanding all the impieties we shall see he taught; though even by asserting that kings, lords, magistrates, priests, pastors, are no longer such from their falling into mortal sin, he has equally subverted all order in the church and state, and filled both with tumult and sedition. John Huss followed this doctrine, and, what is more, said mass to the end of his life, and adored the Eucharist; yet for standing up against the Church of Rome in other points, he must be placed by our reformed in the calendar of their martyrs. In a word, provided they have muttered against any one point of our tenets, especially inveighed against the Pope, in other respects, be they what they will, and of what opinion soever, they stand on the list of Protestant ancestry, and are deemed worthy to keep up the succession of that Church.

---

* Jon. Aur. præf. cont. Claud. Taur.

2.—*The Vaudois and Albigenses weak support to Calvinists.*

But of all the predecessors the Protestants have made choice of, the most welcome to them, at least to the Calvinists, are the Vaudois and Albigenses. What can be their aim in this? It were but a weak support. To make their antiquity rise some ages higher, (for the Vaudois, allowing them all they desire, and Peter de Bruis, with his disciple Henry, reach no further than the eleventh age,) and there to stop short unable to shew one before them, is being forced to a stand much beneath the time of the Apostles; it is calling for help from men as weak and as much put to it as themselves; who, alike with them, are challenged to shew their predecessors; who, no more than they, are able to produce them; who, by consequence, are guilty of the same crime of innovation they are accused of; so that naming them in this cause, is naming accomplices of the same crime, not witnesses that may lawfully depose in their defence.

3.—*Why the Calvinists lay a stress on them.*

Nevertheless, this support, such as it is, is eagerly embraced by our Calvinists, and the reason is this. The Vaudois and Albigenses, it seems, formed churches separated from Rome, which Berengarius and Wickliff never did. Making them therefore their ancestors, is giving themselves, in some manner, a series of church succession. As the origin of these churches, no less than the faith they made profession of, was as yet somewhat obscure at the time of the pretended Reformation, the people were made believe that they were of a very ancient date, and sprung from the first ages of Christianity.

4.—*Ridiculous pretensions of the Vaudois and of Beza.*

I wonder not that Leger, one of the Vaudois Barbes (for so they called their pastors) and their most celebrated historian, has given into this error, for he was unquestionably the most bold and ignorant of all mankind. But there is reason to wonder that it was embraced by Beza, and that he has written in his Ecclesiastical History, not only that the Vaudois, time immemorial, had opposed the abuses of the Church of Rome*, but also, in the year 1541, entered on record, by a public and authentic act, the doctrine taught them as from father to son down from the year 120, after Christ's nativity, as their ancient predecessors always had informed them †.

---

* L. i. p. 35.

† Ibid. 39.

5.—*False origin boasted of by the Vaudois.*

Here is certainly a fine tradition, had it but the least proof to countenance it. But, unfortunately, Waldo's first disciples did not trace it up so high; and the remotest antiquity they challenged was of withdrawing from the Church of Rome at the time when, under Pope Sylvester I., she accepted the temporal domains that Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, endowed her with. This is so frivolous a cause of rupture, and the pretension withal so ridiculous, as not to deserve refuting. A man must have lost his wits to persuade himself that, ever since St. Sylvester's time, that is about the year 320, there was a sect amongst Christians which the Fathers knew nothing of. We have in the councils held in the communion of the Roman Church, anathemas pronounced against an infinity of different sects; we have the catalogues of heresies drawn by St. Epiphanius, by St. Austin, and several other church authors. The most obscure and the least followed sects, those which appeared in a corner of the world, as that of certain women called Collyridians, who were to be met with only in some part of Arabia, that of the Tertullianists or Abelians, who were only in Carthage, or in some villages near Hippo, and many others equally obscure, did not escape their knowledge *. The zeal of pastors that laboured to bring back the strayed sheep, discovered all to save all; none, but these separatists on account of ecclesiastical revenues were unknown to every body. These men, more temperate than an Athanasius, a Basil, an Ambrose, and all the other doctors, more wise than all the councils, who, without rejecting goods given to the Church, were contented with making rules for their just administration; so well, I say, did these men play their part, as never to have been heard of by them. The assurance to assert this, was certainly the height of impudence in the first Vaudois; but, with Beza, to trace back this sect, unknown to all ages, up to the year of our Lord 120, is giving himself ancestors and church succession by too glaring an imposition.

6.—*The design of this Eleventh Book, and what is to be shewn therein.*

The Reformed, disgusted at their novelty, which they were continually upbraided with, stood in need of this weak support.

---

* Epiph. hær. 79. Aug. hær. 86, 87. Tertull.

But, in order to derive some advantage from it, it was also requisite to set other artifices on foot; it was requisite to conceal carefully the true state of these Albigenses and Vaudois. Of two quite different sects they made but one; and this, lest the Reformed should discover amongst their ancestors a too manifest contrariety. But, above all, their abominable doctrine was kept a secret; no notice taken that these Albigenses were complete Manicheans, no less than Peter de Bruis and Henry his disciple; not a word that these Vaudois had separated from the Church upon grounds equally detested by the new Reformation, and by the Church of Rome. The same dissimulation was used in regard of the Polish Vaudois, who were but nominally such; and the people kept ignorant that their doctrine was neither that of the ancient Vaudois, nor that of the Calvinists, nor that of the Lutherans. The history I am going to furnish of these three sects, although epitomized, will be nevertheless supported with such pregnant proofs, as to make the Calvinists ashamed of the ancestors whom they have selected for themselves.

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW MANICHEANS, CALLED THE HERETICS OF TOULOUSE AND ABBY.

7.—*Errors of the Manicheans, progenitors of the Albigenses.*

In order to understand what follows, you must not be wholly ignorant what these Manicheans were. Their whole theology turned on the question of the origin of evil; they beheld it in the world, and were for discovering its principle. It could not be God, because he is infinitely good. It was therefore necessary, said they, to acknowledge another principle, which, being evil by its nature, might be the cause and origin of evil. Here then is the foundation of the error: two first principles, one of good, the other of evil; enemies by consequence, and of a contrary nature; which having fought and mixed in the strife, one diffused good on the world, the other evil; one light, the other darkness; and so on—for it is needless to relate here all the impious extravagances of this abominable sect. It sprung from Paganism, and its principles may be seen even in Plato. It reigned amongst the Persians. Plutarch has acquainted us with the names they gave to the good and evil cause. Manes, a Persian, strove to introduce this prodigy into the Christian religion in Aurelian's reign, viz. towards the end of the third century. Marcion had begun some years before; and his sect, divided into many branches, had prepared the way for the impieties and reveries Manes grafted on it.

8.—*Consequences of the Manicheans' false Principle.*

Now the consequences which these heretics drew from this doctrine were no less absurd than impious. The Old Testament, with all its severity, was but a fable, or at best, but the product of the evil principle; the mystery of the incarnation an illusion; and the flesh of Jesus Christ a phantom: for flesh being the work of the evil principle, Jesus Christ, the son of the good God, could not, in truth, have vested himself with it. As our bodies came from the bad principle, and our souls from the good, or rather were the very substance of it, it was not lawful to beget children, nor unite the substance of the good principle with that of the bad; so that marriage, or rather the generation of children, was prohibited. The flesh of animals, and every thing proceeding from it, as white meats, was the work of the evil cause; the same of wine: all these were impure by nature, and the use of them criminal. Here then are manifestly those men seduced by devils, of whom St. Paul speaks, that were "In latter times . . . .to forbid to marry," and command " to abstain from meats," as unclean, " which God hath commanded*."

9.—*The Manicheans endeavoured to justify themselves by the usages of the Church.*

These wretches, who sought only to deceive the world by appearances, endeavoured to justify themselves by the example of the Catholic Church, wherein the number of those that forbore marriage, from the profession of continence, was very great, and abstinence from certain meats was either practised always, as by many Anchorets after Daniel's example, or at particular times, as in Lent. But the holy fathers replied, that there was a great difference between those that condemned the procreation of children, as the Manicheans did expressly, and those that preferred continence to it with St. Paul and Jesus Christ himself, and judged it unlawful for them to look back, after making profession of so perfect a state of life†. Besides, it was a different thing to abstain from certain meats, either to signify some mystery, as in the Old Testament, or to mortify the senses, as was still continued in the new; a different thing to condemn them with the Manicheans, as impure, as evil, as the work, not of God, but of the bad principle. And the fathers observed, that the apostle expressly impugned this latter sense, which was that of the Manicheans, by these words: every creature of God is good. And, again, by these: nothing is to be refused of all God has created; from thence concluding, that there was no wonder the Holy Ghost had warned the faithful so long before, by the mouth of St. Paul, against so great an abomination.

---

* 1 Tim. iv. 1, 3.

† Aug. l. xxx. cont. Faust. Man. c. 3, 4, 5, 6. Dan. i. 8, 12. 1 Cor. vii. 26, 32, 34, 38. Matt. xix. 12. Luke ix. 62. 1 Tim. iv. 4.

10.—*Three other characteristics of the Manicheans. First, the Spirit of Seduction.*

Such were the principal points of the Manichean doctrine. But this sect had, beside, two remarkable characteristics; one, that in the midst of these impious absurdities, which the devil had inspired them with, they yet mixed something in their discourses of so specious a nature, so prodigiously seducing, that St. Austin himself, so great a genius, was ensnared thereby, and remained amongst them nine whole years, a great zealot of this sect *. It was observed, likewise, that this was one of those heresies which it is most difficult to be reclaimed from; for, to impose upon the vulgar, it had juggling and unaccountable delusions, so far even as to be taxed with sorcery; in a word, none of the implements of seduction were wanting to it.

11.—*Second Characteristic, Hypocrisy.*

The second characteristic of the Manicheans is, their knowing how to conceal what was most detestable in their sect, with so profound an artifice, that not only strangers, but even those of the profession, passed a long time amongst them in ignorance thereof. For beneath the colourable pretext of chastity they hid impurities not to be named, and which made part of their very mysteries. Amongst them were several degrees. Those whom they called auditors, knew not the bottom of their sect; and their elect, namely, those that were let into the whole mystery, carefully kept close from their probationers the abominable secret, till they had been prepared for it by several gradations. They made a show of abstinence and the exterior of a life not only good, but mortified; and one part of the seduction was, the arriving as it were by stages to that which was believed the more perfect, because hidden.

---

* L. ii. cont. Faus. Man. c. 19; et l. iv. Conf. c. i. Theod. l. i. hær. Fab. c. ult. de Manich. Ibid.

12.—*Third Characteristic: mixing with the Catholics in the Churches, and concealing themselves.*

For the third characteristic of these heretics, we may further observe in them a surprising dexterity in mixing with the faithful, and concealing themselves under the appearance of the same profession; for this dissimulation was one of the artifices they employed to inveigle men into their sentiments*. They were seen promiscuously with others in the churches; there they received the communion; and although they never received the blood of our Lord, as well because they detested wine used in consecration, as also because they did not believe Jesus Christ had true blood, the liberty allowed in the Church of partaking of one or both kinds, was the cause that, for a long time, the perpetual affectation of their rejecting that of wine, passed unperceived. At length, St. Leo discovered them by this mark: but their cunning to elude the notice of the Catholics, however vigilant, was so great, that they still concealed themselves, and scarce were discovered under the pontificate of St. Gelasius. At that time, therefore, in order to render them wholly distinguishable to the people, it was necessary to proceed to an express prohibition of communicating otherwise than under both kinds; and to show that this prohibition was not founded on the necessity of always taking them conjointly, St. Gelasius† grounds it in formal terms on this ground, because those who refused the sacred wine did it through a certain superstition; an evident proof, that, were it not for this superstition, which rejected one of the parts of this mystery as evil, the usage in its nature had been free and indifferent, even in solemn assemblies. Protestants that believed this word, superstition, was not strong enough to express the abominable practices of the Manicheans, did not reflect that this word, in the Latin tongue, signifies all false religion; but that it is particularly appropriated to the Manichean sect, on account of their abstinences and superstitious observances: the books of St. Austin prove this sufficiently‡.

13.—*The Paulicians or Manicheans of Armenia.*

This so hidden a sect, so abominable, so full of seduction, of superstition, and hypocrisy, notwithstanding imperial laws which condemned its followers to death, yet maintained and diffused itself. The Emperor Anastasius, and the Empress Theodora, wife to Justinian, had given it countenance. The followers thereof are to be seen under the children of Heraclius, that is, in the seventh age, in Armenia, a province bordering on Persia, the birth-place of this detestable superstition, and formerly subject to the empire. They were there settled*, or confirmed by one named Paul, from whom the name of Paulicians was given them in the East, by one named Constantine, and, finally, by one named Sergius. They arrived to so great power in that country, either by the weakness of the government, or the protection of the Saracens, or even by the favour of the Emperor Nicephoras, much wedded to this sect, that at length, being persecuted by the Empress Theodora, the wife of Basil, they were able to build cities, and take up arms against their sovereigns †.

---

* Leo i. Serm. 45. Qui est iv. de Quadr. c. 5.

† Gelas. in Dec. Grat. de conf. distinct. 2. c. Comperimus. Yvo. Microl. &c.

‡ De morib. Ecc. Cath. c. 34. De morib. Manich. c. 18. Cont. Ep. fundam. c. 15.

14.—*History of the Paulicians, by Peter of Sicily, addressed to the Archbishop of Bulgaria.*

These wars were long and bloody under the reign of Basil the Macedonian, to wit, at the close of the ninth century. Peter of Sicily ‡ was sent by this Emperor to Tibrica in Armenia, which Cedrenus calls Tephrica, a stronghold of these heretics, to treat about the exchange of prisoners. During this time, he became thoroughly acquainted with the Paulicians, and dedicated a book concerning their errors to the Archbishop of Bulgaria, for reasons hereafter specified. Vossius acknowledges we are much obliged to Raderus for giving us, in Greek and Latin, so particular and so excellent a history§. There Peter of Sicily || paints out to us these heretics in their proper characters, their principles, the contempt they had of the Old Testament, their prodigious address in concealing themselves when they pleased, and the other marks already mentioned. But he notices two or three which must not be forgotten, *viz.*, their particular aversion to the Images of Christ crucified ¶, a natural consequence of their error, forasmuch as they rejected the passion and death of the Son of God; their contempt of the Holy Virgin, whom they did not account the mother of Jesus Christ, since they denied his human flesh; and, above all, their abhorrence of the Eucharist.**

---

* Cedr. t. i. p. 432.
† Ibid. t. ii. p. 480. Ibid. p. 541.
‡ Pet. Sic. Hist. de Manich. Cedr. Ib. 541, &c.
§ Voss. de Hist. Græc.
|| Pet. Sic. Ib. Præf. &c.
¶ Ibid.
** Ibid.

15.—*The conformity of the Paulicians with the Manicheans, whom St. Austin refuted.*

Cedrenus[*], who has taken the greatest part of what he writes of the Paulicians from this historian, instances, after him, these three characteristics, namely, their aversion to the Cross, to the blessed Virgin, and the holy Eucharist. The same sentiments had the Manicheans of old. We learn from St. Austin[†], their eucharist was different from ours, and something so execrable as not to be thought on, much less written. But the new Manicheans had also received, from the ancient, another doctrine, we are to observe. So long since as St. Austin's time, Faustus, the Manichean, upbraided the Catholics with their idolatry in the honour they paid the holy martyrs, and in the sacrifices they offered on their relics[‡]. St. Austin pointed out to them this worship had nothing common with that of the heathens, because it was not the worship of Latria, or of subjection and perfect servitude; and if they offered to God the holy oblation of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, at the tombs and on the relics of the martyrs, they were far from offering to them this sacrifice, but hoped only "To excite themselves thereby to the imitation of their virtues, to be brought into partnership with their merits; and, lastly, to be assisted by their prayers." So clear an answer did not prevent the new Manicheans from continuing the calumnies of their forefathers. Peter of Sicily[§] acquaints us, that a Manichean woman seduced an ignorant layman called Sergius, by telling him, Catholics honoured the saints as divinities, and for that reason laymen were hindered from reading the Holy Scripture, lest they should discover a number of the like errors.

16.—*The design of the Paulicians on the Bulgarians; and Peter of Sicily's instruction to hinder the effect.*

It was by such calumnies as these the Manicheans seduced the ignorant. A great desire of enlarging their sect was always remarked amongst them. Peter of Sicily[||] discovered, whilst ambassador at Tibrica, that it was resolved in the council of the Paulicians, to send preachers of their sect into Bulgaria, in order to seduce those new converts. Thrace, bordering on this province, had been infected with this heresy long before. So there was but too much reason to fear the worst for the Bulgarians, should the Paulicians, the most cunning of the Manichean sect, attempt to seduce them; and it was this induced Peter of Sicily to inscribe the above-mentioned book to their archbishop, to secure them against such dangerous heretics. In spite of all his pains, it is certain the Manichean heresy took deep root in Bulgaria, and thence soon after spread itself over the other parts of Europe; whence came, as we shall see, the name of Bulgarians, given as the followers of this heresy.

---

[*] Cedr. t. ii. p. 434. [†] Aug. hær. 46, &c. Lib. xx. Cont. Faus. c. 4. [‡] Ibid. c. 21, *et seq.* Ibid. c. 18. [§] Peter Sic. ibid.
[||] Peter Sic. initio lib.

17.—*The Manicheans begin to appear in the West after the year of our Lord one thousand.*

A thousand years had elapsed since the birth of Jesus Christ, and the prodigious relaxation of discipline threatened the Western Church with some extraordinary disaster. Besides, it was not unlikely the dreadful time when Satan was to be let loose, foretold in the Revelations*, after a thousand years, which may denote a thousand years after the strong-armed, to wit, the victorious Satan, was bound by Jesus Christ at his coming into the world†. Howsoever that may be, in this time and in 1017, during king Robert's reign, heretics were discovered at Orleans, of such a doctrine, as long before had been unheard of amongst the Latins‡.

18.—*Manicheans that came from Italy, discovered at Orleans in the time of King Robert.*

An Italian woman brought into France this abominable heresy. Two Canons of Orleans §, one called Stephen or Heribert; the other Lisoïus, both men of reputation, were the first inveigled. There was great difficulty in discovering their secret. But at length a person, named Arifaste, suspecting what it might be, having insinuated himself into their familiarity, these heretics and their followers confessed, after a great deal of pains, that they denied the human flesh of Jesus Christ; that they did not believe remission of sins was given in baptism; nor that the bread and wine could be changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. It was discovered, they had a particular Eucharist, by them called the celestial food. It was cruel and abominable, and wholly suitable to the Manichean genius, although not found amongst those of old. But besides what was seen at Orleans, Guy of Nogent[*] also takes notice of it in other countries; nor is it to be wondered at that new prodigies are to be met with in so close a sect, whether invented by them, or but newly brought to light.

---

* Rev. xx. 2, 3, 7.

† Mat. xii. 29. Luke xi. 21, 22.

‡ Acta Conc. Aurel. spicil. t. ii. Conc. Lab. t. ix. Glab. lib. iii. c. 8.

§ Glab. ibid. Acta Conc. Aurel.

19.—*Sequel.*

Here are the general characteristics of Manicheism. We have seen these heretics reject the incarnation. As for baptism, St. Austin[†] says expressly, the Manicheans did not give it, and believed it useless. Peter of Sicily[‡], and after him Cedrenus[§], tells us the same of the Paulicians; altogether shew us that the Manicheans had a different eucharist from ours. What was said by the heretics of Orleans, that we ought not to beg the saints' assistance, was also of the same stamp, and sprung, as is seen above, from the ancient source of this sect.

20.—*Sequel.*

They said nothing openly of the two principles, but spoke with contempt of the creation, and the books which record it, meaning the Old Testament; and confessed, at the very time of execution, that they had entertained evil sentiments concerning the Lord of the universe[||]. The reader will remember, that he was judged the evil principle by the Manicheans. They went to the stake with joy, in hopes of a miraculous delivery, so strangely were they possessed with the spirit of seduction. Now this was the first instance of the like punishment. It is known, the Roman laws condemned the Manicheans to death; the holy king Robert judged them worthy of the flames[¶].

21.—*The same Heresy in Gascony and at Toulouse.*

At the same time, the same heresy is discovered in Aquitaine and Toulouse, as appears by the history of Ademarus[**], of Chabanes, monk of the abbey of St. Cibard, in Angouleme, contemporary with these heretics. An ancient writer of the history of Aquitaine, published by the celebrated Peter Pithou[††], informs us, that there were discovered in this province, whereof Perigord made part, "Manicheans, that rejected baptism, the sign of the holy cross, the church, and the Redeemer himself;

---

[*] De vitâ suâ, lib. iii. c. 16. [†] De hær. in hær. Man. [‡] Peter. Sic. Ib.
[§] Cedr. t. i. p. 434. [||] Ibid. [¶] Cond. de hær. l. 52.
[**] Bib. nov. l'Abb. t. ii. pp. 176, 180.
[††] Frag. Hist. Aquit. edita à Petro Pith. Bar. t. xi. An. 1017.

denying his incarnation and passion, and the honour due to saints, lawful marriage, and the use of meat." And the same author shows us they were of the same sect with the heretics of Orleans, whose error came from Italy.

22.—*The Manicheans of Italy called Cathari, and why.*

In effect, we see the Manicheans had settled in that country. They were called Cathari, as much as to say, pure. Formerly other heretics had assumed that name the Novatians, in the persuasion that their life was more pure than that of others, on account of the severity of their discipline. But the Manicheans, elated with their continency and abstinence from flesh, which they believed unclean, accounted themselves not only Cathari, or pure, but also, as St. Austin* relates, Catharists, namely, purifiers, by reason of that part of the divine substance, which was mixed with the herbs and pulse together with the contrary substance, from which, in eating them, they separated and purified this divine substance. These, I own, are monstrous opinions; and it were hardly to be believed, that men could have been so strangely infatuated, had not experience taught us that God sets, to man's proud mind, examples of the blindness he may fall into, when abandoned to himself. This, then, is the true original of the heretics of France, sprung from the Cathari of Italy.

23.—*Origin of the Manicheans of Toulouse and Italy.—Proof that they came from Bulgaria.*

Vignier, whom our reformed have accounted the restorer of history in the last age, speaks of this heresy, and the discovery thereof made in the council of Orleans, whose date he places, by mistake, in 1021, and observes, that "In this year many people were taken and burnt, for the crime of heresy, in the presence of king Robert; for it is written (continues he) that they spoke ill of God and the Sacraments, to wit, of baptism and the body and blood of Jesus Christ, as likewise of marriage;" nor would eat meats that had blood and fat, reputing them unclean†. He reports, also, that the chief of these heretics was called Stephen, whereof he cites Glaber as a witness, with the chronicle of St. Cibard; "according to whose testimony," proceeds he, "many other followers of the same heresy, called Manicheans, were executed elsewhere, as at Toulouse and in Italy." No matter though this author was mistaken in the date, and some other circumstances of his history; he had not seen the acts, which have been recovered since that time. It is enough that this heresy of Orleans, which had Stephen for one of its authors, on the enormities of which king Robert took vengeance, and whose history Glaber hath reported, be acknowledged for Manichean by Vignier; that he held it for the source of that heresy which afterwards was punished at Toulouse, and that all this impiety, as we are going to see, was derived from Bulgaria.

---

* De hær. in hær. Man.

† Bib. Hist. 2. p. in the year 1022. p. 672.

24.—*The same Origin proved by an ancient Author quoted by Vignier—(addition to the Second Part.)*

An ancient author, cited in the additions of the same Vignier, leaves no room to doubt of it. The passage of this author, which Vignier transcribes entire in Latin, imports, "that as soon as the heresy of the Bulgarians began to spread itself in Lombardy, they had for Bishop a certain man called Mark, who had received his ordination from Bulgaria, and under whom were the Lombards, the Tuscans, and those of Mark Ancona; but that another Pope, named Nicetas, came from Constantinople into Lombardy, who impeached the ordination of Bulgaria; and that Mark had received his from Drungaria*."

25.—*Sequel of the same Passage.*

What country he meant by Drungaria I have no need to examine. Renier, thoroughly acquainted, as we shall see, with all these heresies, tells us of the Manichean churches of Duganicia and Bulgaria, whence come all the rest of the sect both in Italy and France†; which perfectly well agrees, as is plain, with Vignier's author‡. In this same ancient author of Vignier, we see that this heresy, brought from beyond sea, to wit, from Bulgaria, thence spread itself through other provinces, where afterwards it was in great vogue, into Languedoc, Toulouse, and especially into Gascony; whence the name of Albigenses, as, for the like reason, that of Bulgares was conferred on the sect, on account of its origin. I shall not repeat what Vignier § observes, how the name Bulgare was turned to its present signification in our language. The word is too infamous, but its derivation certain; nor is it less certain that the Albigenses were called by this name in token of the place they came from, namely from Bulgaria.

---

* Bib. Hist. p. 133.

† Ren. cont. Wald. c. 6. t. iv.

‡ Bibl. P. P. part. ii. p. 759.

§ Vignier. ib.

26.—*Council of Tours and Toulouse against the Manicheans of this last City.*

There needs no more to convict these heretics of Manicheism. But, in process of time, the evil grew more apparent, principally in Languedoc and Toulouse, for this city was like the metropolis of the sect, "whence the heresy, extending itself," as speaks the Canon of Alexander III. in the Council of Tours, "like a cancer, into the neighbouring countries, infected Gascony and the other provinces*." As the source of the evil, as I may say, there took its rise, there also the remedy was first applied. The Pope Callixtus II. held a Council at Toulouse†, where were condemned the heretics that "rejected the sacrament of our Lord's body and blood, infant-baptism, the priesthood, and all ecclesiastic orders, with lawful marriage." The same canon was repeated in the general Council of Lateran‡ under Innocent II. The character of Manicheism is here seen in the condemnation of marriage. And again, in rejecting the sacrament of the Eucharist; for it ought to be particularly observed, that the canon imports, not that these heretics had some error respecting the sacrament, but that they rejected it, as we have seen the Manicheans did likewise.

27.—*Their conformity with the Manicheans known by St. Austin.—The same Heresy in Germany.*

As for the priesthood and all ecclesiastical orders, the total subversion of the hierarchy introduced by the Manicheans, and the contempt they had of all church-subordination, may be seen in St. Augustin and other authors§. In respect of infant-baptism, we shall observe hereafter, that the new Manicheans impugned it with particular industry; and although they rejected baptism in general, what struck men with surprise was chiefly the refusal they made of this sacrament to children, whilst the Church in general shewed so much eagerness to confer it on them. Therefore, the sensible characteristics, whereby this Toulousian, afterwards called Albigensian heresy, made itself known, were specified in this canon of Toulouse and Lateran. The bottom of the error lay more deeply concealed. But the more this cursed offspring from Bulgaria diffused itself in the West, their Manichean tenets became the more palpable

---

* Conc. Tur. ii. c. 3. † Conc. Tol. An. 1119. Can. 3.

‡ Conc. Later. ii. An. 1139. Can. 23.

§ Aug. de hær. in hær. Man. Ecb. Serm. i. Bib. PP. t. iv. part ii. p. 81. Ren. cont. Wald. c. 6.

They penetrated into the heart of Germany, and the Emperor Henry IV. there discovered them at Goslar, a city of Suabia, towards the middle of the eleventh century, surprised whence could proceed this Manichean progeny*. These here were known by their abstaining "from the flesh of animals of what kind soever, and believing their use prohibited." The error soon spread in Germany on all sides; and in the twelfth century, many of these heretics were met with near about Cologne. The name of Cathari made the sect known, and Ecbert, a contemporary author and able divine, shews us, in these Cathari near Cologne, all the Manichean characters†; the same detestation of flesh and marriage; the same contempt of baptism; the same abhorrence of communion; the same repugnance to believe the truth of the Son of God's incarnation and passion: in short, other similar marks which it is needless to repeat.

28.—*Sequel of Ecbert's Sentiments concerning the Manicheans of Germany.*

But as heresies change, or in time shew themselves plainer, so many new tenets and usages are perceptible in this. For instance, in explaining to us amongst the rest, the contempt the Manicheans had of baptism, Ecbert informs us, that although they rejected the baptism of water, they gave, with lighted torches, a certain baptism of fire, the ceremony of which he sets forth‡. They were firmly opposed to infant baptism, which I notice once more, it being one of the distinguishing marks of these new Manicheans§. They had likewise another not less remarkable; their maintaining that the sacraments lost their virtue by the bad life of those that administered them. Wherefore, they exaggerated the corruption of the clergy, in order to make it appear that we had no longer any sacraments amongst us; and this is one of the reasons for which we have seen they were accused of rejecting all ecclesiastical orders, together with the priesthood.

29.—*It is discovered that they held two first Principles.*

The belief of these new heretics, as to the two principles, was not as yet fully brought to light. For although men were very sensible this was the foundation of their rejecting the union of both sexes, and whatever proceeded from it in all animals, as flesh, eggs, and white meats, yet, as far as I can find, Ecbert is the first that objects this error to them in express terms. Nay, he says, "he had most certainly discovered," that their private motive for abstaining from flesh was, "Because the devil was the creator of it*." You see how difficult it was to dive to the bottom of their doctrine; yet it appeared sufficiently by its consequences.

---

* Herm. cont. ad An. 1052. Par. To. xi. ad eund. An. Centuriat. in Cent. xi. c. 5. sub fin.

† Ecb. Serm. xii. adv. Cath. t. iv. Bib. PP. part ii.

‡ Serm. i. viii. xi.

§ Serm. vii. Serm. iv., &c.

30.—*Variations of these Heretics.*

We learn from this same author†, that these heretics shewed themselves, at times, more moderate in regard to marriage. One called Hartuvinus allowed a youth amongst them to marry a maiden, but required they should be both virgins, and not proceed beyond the first child; which I take notice of, in order to shew the oddities of a sect contradictory to itself, and often forced to act counter to its own principles.

31.—*Their industry to conceal themselves.*

But the most certain mark by which to know these heretics, was the pains they took to conceal themselves, not only by receiving the sacraments with us, but also by answering like us when urged regarding their faith. This was the spirit of the sect from its beginning, and we have before taken notice of it, ever since the time of St. Austin and St. Leo. Peter of Sicily‡, and after him Cedrenus, shew us the same character in the Paulicians. They did not only deny in general that they were Manicheans, but also, when interrogated in particular concerning each tenet of their faith, they feigned themselves Catholics, betraying their sentiments by manifest lies, or at least disguising them by equivocations worse than lies, because more artful and more fraught with hypocrisy §. For example, when spoken to concerning the water of baptism, they received it, understanding by the water of baptism, the doctrine of our Lord, whereby souls are purified. All they say abounded with the like allegories; and men took them for orthodox, unless from long custom they had learnt to see through their equivocations.

32.—*Their equivocations when interrogated about Faith.*

Ecbert informs us of one which it was impossible to guess at. It was known that they rejected the Eucharist; and when, to sound them on so important an article, they were asked whether they made the body of our Lord? they answered readily, They made it, understanding that their own body, which they made in some wise by their food, was the body of Jesus Christ, by reason that, according to St. Paul, they were the members of it*. By these artifices they appeared, outwardly, good Catholics. But, what is yet more unaccountable, one of their tenets was, that the Gospel forbad swearing for whatsoever cause †: nevertheless, when examined concerning their religion, they believed it lawful not only to lie, but to forswear themselves; and had learnt from the ancient Priscillianists, another branch of the Manicheans known in Spain, this verse, cited by St. Austin: "Jura, perjura, secretum prodere noli: Swear true or false, as long as thou betrayest not the secret of the sect ‡." For which reason Ecbert styled them obscure men, men that did not preach, but whispered in the ear, who lurked in corners, and muttered rather in private than explained their doctrine §. This was one of the sect's allurements; there was something of a charm in this impenetrable secret observed amongst them; and as the wise man said, "Those waters you drink by stealth are the pleasantest ||." St. Bernard, who was well acquainted with these heretics, as we shall soon see, remarks in them this particular character, that, whereas other heretics, urged on by the spirit of pride, sought only to make themselves known; these, on the contrary, strove only to conceal themselves—others aimed at victory; but these, more mischievous, sought only to annoy, lurking silently in the grass, that they might instil their poison the more securely as the bite was less expected ¶. The thing was, their error, once discovered, was already half vanquished by its own absurdity; wherefore they betook themselves to the ignorant, to mechanics, to silly women, to peasants, and recommended nothing so much to them as this mysterious secret.

---

* Ecb. Serm. vi. p. 99.

† Serm. v. p. 94.

‡ Petr. Sic. init. lib. de Hist. Man.

§ Ibid. Cedr. t. i. p. 434.

33.—*Enervin consults St. Bernard about the Manicheans near Cologne.*

Enervin, who served God in a church near Cologne, at the time these new Manicheans, whom Ecbert speaks of, were

---

* Ecb. Serm. i. ii. † Bern. in Cant. Serm. lxv.

‡ De hær. in hær. Priscil. Ecb. Serm. ii. Bern. Ib. init. lib. id. Serm. i. ii. vii., &c. § Ibid.

|| Prov. ix. 17. Serm. lxv. in Cantic.

¶ Ibid. Ecb. init. lib. &c. Bern. Serm. lxv, lxvi.

discovered there, gives in the main the same account of them as this author; and not finding in the church a greater doctor to whom he could address himself for their conviction than the great St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, he wrote him that fine letter which the learned Francis Mabillon has given us in his Analects *. Therein, besides the dogmata of these heretics, which it is needless to repeat, we see the particularities which occasioned their discovery; we see the distinction between "the Auditors and the Elect," a certain character of Manicheism specified by St. Austin; we there see that they had their Pope, a truth which afterwards became more manifest; and in fine, that they boasted, "their doctrine had a continued succession down to us, but hidden ever since the time of the martyrs, and after that in Greece, and in some other countries;" which is very true, since it came from Marcion and Manes, heresiarchs of the third century; and thereby it is apparent in whose shop was first vended this method of maintaining the Church's perpetuity, by a hidden series, and doctors scattered here and there without any manifest and legitimate succession.

34.—*These Heretics interrogated before all the people.*

But, lest it should be said the doctrine of these heretics was, perchance, calumniated for want of being well understood, it appears, as well by Enervin's letter as by Ecbert's sermons†, that the examination of these heretics was made in public; and that it was one of their bishops, with a companion of his, who defended their doctrine to their utmost, in the presence of the archbishop, the whole clergy, and all the people.

35.—*The tenets of these Heretics refuted by St. Bernard, who was well acquainted with them at Toulouse.*

St. Bernard, whom the pious Enervin excited to confute these heretics, then composed the two fine sermons on the Canticles, in which he so vigorously impugned the heretics of his time. They carry so manifest a relation to Enervin's letter, that it is plain this gave occasion to them; but it is no less plain by St. Bernard's firm and positive way of speaking, that he had also other informations, and knew more of the matter than Enervin himself. And, indeed, it was now above twenty years since Peter de Bruis and his disciple Henry had secretly spread their errors in Dauphiny, in Provence, and especially in the neighbourhood of Toulouse. St. Bernard took a journey into that country expressly to root up this bad seed, and the miracles he there wrought in confirmation of the Catholic truth are more conspicuous than the sun. But the material point to be observed is, that he spared no pains to inform himself fully concerning a heresy he was going to oppose; and after frequent conferences with the disciples of these heretics, he could not be ignorant of their doctrine. Now he distinctly instances, together with their condemnation "of infant baptism*, the invocation of saints, the oblations for the dead," that of "the use of marriage, and of all that proceeded," far or near, "from the union of both sexes, as flesh and white meats †." He taxes them likewise with not admitting the Old Testament, and their receiving the Gospel only. Another, also, of their errors remarked by St. Bernard was ‡, that a sinner ceased to be a bishop, and that the popes, the archbishops, the bishops, and priests, were neither capable of giving or receiving the sacraments, by reason they were sinners. But what he most insists on, is their hypocrisy, not only in the deceitful appearance of their austere and penitential life, but also in the custom they constantly observed of receiving the sacraments with us, and professing our doctrine publicly, which they inveighed against in secret §. St. Bernard shews their piety was all dissimulation. In appearance they blamed commerce with women, and nevertheless were all seen to pass days and nights apart with them. The profession they made of abhorring the sex, seemed to warrant their not abusing it. They believed all oaths forbidden, yet, examined concerning their faith, did not stick at perjury; such oddness and inconstancy is there in extravagant minds ‖! From all these things St. Bernard concluded this was "the mystery of iniquity" foretold by St. Paul ¶, so much the more to be feared in proportion as it was more hidden; and that these were they whom the Holy Ghost made known to the same apostle, as "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God has created **." All the characters agree too clearly with them to need insisting on. Behold here the fine ancestors whom the Calvinists have selected for themselves!

---

* Enervin, Ep. ad S. Bern. Anal. iii. p. 452; Ibid. pp. 455, 456, 457.
† Ibid. p. 453. Ecb. Serm. i.

---

* Serm. lxvi.
† Serm. lxv.
‡ Serm. lxvi.
§ Serm. lxv.
‖ Ibid.
¶ 2 Thess. ii. 7.
** Serm. lxvi. 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3.

36.—*Peter de Bruis, and Henry.*

To say that these heretics of Toulouse, of whom St. Bernard speaks, are not the same with those vulgarly called Albigenses, were too gross a fallacy. The ministers are agreed that Peter de Bruis and Henry are two chiefs of this sect, and that Peter, the venerable Abbot of Cluny, their contemporary, of whom we shall soon speak, attacked the "Albigenses under the name of Petrobusians *." If the chiefs are convicted of Manicheism, the disciples have not degenerated from this doctrine, and these bad trees may be judged of by their fruit; for although it be certain, from St. Bernard's letters, and from the authors then living, that he converted many of these Toulousian heretics, the disciples of Peter de Bruis and Henry, yet the race was not extinguished, which the more private it kept itself the more proselytes it gained †. They were called "the good men" from their apparent meekness and simplicity; but their doctrine became manifest in an interrogatory many of them underwent at Lombez, a little town near Alby, in a council held there in 1176 ‡.

37.—*The Council of Lombez.—Famous examination of these Heretics.*

Gaucelin, bishop of Lodeve, equally well acquainted with their artifices and with sound doctrine, was there commissioned to examine them concerning their faith. They shuffle in many articles; they lie in others; but own in express terms, that "They reject the Old Testament; that they believe the consecration of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, equally good whether made by laymen or clergy, if good men; that all swearing is unlawful; and that bishops and priests, devoid of the qualities prescribed by St. Paul, are neither bishops nor priests." They never could be brought, whatever was said, to approve of marriage, nor infant baptism; and the obstinate refusal to acknowledge such certain truths, was taken for a confession of their error. They were condemned also from the Scripture as men that refused to confess their faith; and, on all the points proposed, were hard pressed by Ponce, archbishop of Narbonne, by Arnold bishop of Nismes, by the abbots, and especially by Gaucelin bishop of Lodeve, whom Gerald, bishop of Alby, there present, and ordinary of Lombez, before the place was erected into a bishopric, had vested with his authority. I do not think there can be seen, in any council, either a more regular procedure, or Scripture better employed, or a dispute more precise and convincing. Let men come and tell us after this, that what is said of the Albigenses is all mere calumny.

---

* La Roq. Hist. de l' Euch., pp. 452, 453.

† Ep. 241 ad Tol. Vit. S. Bern. lib. iii. c. 5.

‡ Act. Conc. Lumb. t. x. Conc. Lab. An. 1176.

38.—*History of the same Council by a contemporary Author.*

An historian of those times recites at length this council, and gives a faithful abridgment of more ample acts which have been since recovered *. He begins his account thus: "There were heretics in the province of Toulouse, who would have themselves be called good men, and were maintained by the soldiers of Lombez. Those said, they neither received the law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, nor the Old Testament, nor the Doctors of the New, except the Gospels, St. Paul's Epistles, the seven canonical Epistles, the Acts, and Revelations." Setting all the rest aside, here is enough to make our Protestants blush for the errors of their ancestors.

39.—*Why these Heretics are called Arians.*

But in order to raise a suspicion of some calumny in the proceedings against them, they observe, they were not called Manicheans but Arians; yet the Manicheans were never accused of Arianism; a mistake, say they, which Baronius himself has owned †. What a fetch is this, to cavil about the title men give a heresy, when they see it specified, not to mention other marks, by that of rejecting the Old Testament! But we must also shew these contentious spirits, what reason there was to accuse the Manicheans of Arianism. It was because, as Peter of Sicily expressly tells us, "They professed the Trinity in words, but denied it in their hearts, and turned the mystery into impertinent allegories ‡."

40.—*The sentiments of the Manicheans concerning the Trinity, from St. Austin.*

This is likewise what St. Austin fully informs us of. Faustus, bishop of the Manicheans, had written: "We confess under three names one only and the same Divinity of God the Father Almighty, of Jesus Christ his Son, and of the Holy Ghost §." But then he further adds, "that the Father dwelt in the principal and sovereign light called by St. Paul inaccessible. As for the Son, he resided in the second light, which is visible; and being twofold, according to the Apostle who speaks of the power and wisdom of Jesus Christ, his power resided in the sun, and his wisdom in the moon; and finally, in regard of the Holy Ghost, his habitation was in our ambient air[*]." This is what Faustus said: whereby St. Austin convicts him of separating the Son from the Father even by corporeal spaces; nay, of separating him from himself, and of separating the Holy Ghost from them both; to situate them also, as did Faustus, in places so unequal, was placing between the divine persons a too manifest inequality. Such were these allegories fraught with ignorance, by which Peter of Sicily convicted the Manicheans of denying the Trinity. Such an explanation as this was far from a confession of it; but, as St. Austin says, "was squaring the belief of the Trinity by the rule of his own conceits." An author of the twelfth century, contemporary with St. Bernard[†], acquaints us that these heretics declined saying, Gloria Patri; and Renier states it expressly that the Cathari or Albigenses did not believe that the Trinity was one only God, but believed that the Father was greater than the Son and the Holy Ghost[‡]. No wonder then that the Catholics have sometimes ranked the Manicheans with those that denied the blessed Trinity, and, on this consideration, given them the name of Arians.

---

* Roger. Hoved. in Annal. Angl.

† La Roq. ib. Bar. t. xii. An. 1176, p. 674.

‡ Pet. Sic. ibid.

§ Faust. ap. Aug. lib. xx. cont.

41.—*Manicheans at Soissons.—The Testimony of Guy of Nogent.*

To return to the Manicheism of these heretics: Guy of Nogent[§], a celebrated author of the twelfth age and more ancient than St. Bernard, shews us heretics near Soissons that made a phantom of the incarnation; that rejected infant baptism; that held in abhorrence the mystery wrought at the Altar; yet took the sacraments with us; that rejected all manner of flesh, and whatsoever proceeds from the union of both sexes. They made, after the example of those heretics above seen at Orleans, a Eucharist and sacrifice not fit to be described; and, to shew themselves completely like the other Manicheans, "they concealed themselves like them, and mixed clandestinely amongst us," confessing and swearing anything, to save themselves from punishment[||].

---

[*] Faust. ap. Aug. c. 7.
[†] Herib. Mon. Ep. Annal. iii.
[‡] Ren. cont. Wald. c. 6. t. iv. Bib. PP. p. 759.
[§] De vitâ suâ, lib. iii. c. 16.
[||] Ibid.

42.—*Testimony of Radulphus Ardens concerning the Heretics of the Agenois.*

Let us add to these witnesses Radulphus Ardens, a renowned author of the eleventh age, in the description he gives us of the heretics of the Agenois, who "brag of leading the life of the Apostles; who say, they do not lie, they do not swear; who condemn the use of flesh and marriage; who reject the Old Testament, and receive a part only of the New; and, what is more terrible, admit two Creators; who say, the Sacrament of the Altar is nothing but mere bread; who despise baptism and the resurrection of bodies*." Are not these Manicheans in their proper colours? Now we descry no other characteristics in them than in those of Toulouse and Alby, whose sect, we have seen, extended itself into Gascony and the adjacent provinces. Agen also had its particular doctors: but, be that as it will, the same spirit is discernible every where, and all is of the same stamp.

43.—*The same Heretics in England.*

Thirty of these heretics of Gascony took shelter in England in the year 1160. They were called Poplicans or Publicans. But let us see what was their doctrine from Gulielmus Neobridgensis, an historian near to those times, whose testimony Spelman, a protestant author, has inserted in the second volume of his English Councils †. "These heretics," says he, "were brought before the council held at Oxford. Girard, the only person of any learning, answered well as to the substance of the heavenly physician: but proceeding to the remedies he had left us, they spoke very ill, abhorring baptism, the Eucharist and marriage, and despising Catholic unity." Protestants put in the catalogue of their ancestors these Gascoign heretics, for speaking ill (in the sentiment of the English nation, then believing the real presence) of the Eucharistic sacrament ‡. But they ought to have considered, that these Poplicans stand accused, not of denying the real presence, but of abhorring the Eucharist, no less than baptism and marriage,—three visible characteristics of Manicheism: nor do I hold these heretics wholly justified as to the other points, under pretext that they did not answer amiss; for we have seen too much of the wiles of these people; and at best they would not the less be Manicheans for mitigating some few errors of this sect.

---

* Rodul. Ard. Serm. in Dom. viii. post Trin. t. ii.

† Gul. Nes. Rer. Ang. lib. ii. c. 13. Conc. Oxon. t. ii. Conc. Ang. Conc. Lab. t. x. An. 1160.

‡ La Roq. Hist. de l'Euch. c. xviii. p. 460.

44.—*That the Poplicans or Publicans are Manicheans.*

Even the name of Publicans or Poplicans was a name of the Manicheans, as is manifestly seen from the testimony of William le Breton. This author, in the life of Philip Augustus, dedicated to his eldest son Lewis, speaking of these heretics, vulgarly called Poplicans, says, "that they rejected marriage; accounted it a crime to eat flesh; and had other superstitions specified by St. Paul in a few words: viz. in the first to Timothy *."

45.—*The ministers make the Vaudois Manicheans, in making them Poplicans.*

Our Reformed nevertheless think they do an honour to the disciples of Waldo by ranking them amongst the Poplicans. There needed no more to condemn the Vaudois. But I shall take no advantage from this mistake: I shall leave to the Vaudois their particular heresies, it being enough for me here to have shewn the Poplicans convicted of Manicheism †.

46.—*The Manicheans of Ermengard.*

I own, with the Protestants, that Ermengard's treatise ought not to have been entitled, "against the Vaudois," as it was by Gretser, for he speaks in no respect concerning these heretics; but the fact is, in Gretser's time, the general name of Vaudois was given to all sects separate from Rome ever since the eleventh or twelfth century down to Luther's days: which was the reason that this author, publishing divers treatises against these sects, gave them this common title, "against the Vaudois ‡." Yet he did not omit to preserve to each book the title he had found in the manuscript. Now Ermengard or Ermengaud had entitled his book thus: "A Treatise against these Heretics, who say it is the devil, and not God, that created the world and all things visible §." He refutes in particular, chapter by chapter, all the errors of these heretics, which are all those of Manicheism so frequently noticed by us ||. If they speak against the Eucharist, they speak no less against baptism; if they reject the worship of saints, and our

* Phil. lib. i. Duch. t. v. Hist. France, p. 102.

† La Roque, p. 455.

‡ Aubert. La Roque.

§ Tom. x. Bib. PP. part i., p. 1233.

|| Ibid. cap. xi. Ibid. xii. Ibid. xiii. Ibid. c. i. ii. iii. vii. Ibid. v. xv. xvi.

other doctrinal points, they do no less reject the creation, the incarnation, the law of Moses, marriage, eating of flesh, and the resurrection ; so that to value themselves on the authority of this sect, is placing their glory in infamy itself.

47.—*An examination of the Authors who treat of the Manicheans and Vaudois is proceeded to.*

I pass by many other witnesses which, after so many convincing proofs, are no longer necessary; but some there are not to be omitted, for this reason, that they insensibly lead us to the knowledge of the Vaudois.

48.—*Proof from Alanus that the Heretics of Montpellier are Manicheans.*

In the first place, I produce Alanus, a famous monk of the Cistercian order, and one of the first authors that wrote against the Vaudois. He dedicated a treatise against the heretics of his time to the Count of Montpellier, his lord, and divided it into two books. The first regards the heretics of his country. To them he ascribes the two principles, the denial of Jesus Christ's incarnation, and attributing to him a fantastical body, and all the other points of Manicheism, against the law of Moses, against the Resurrection, against the use of Flesh, and Marriage*; to which he adds some other things we had not as yet seen in the Albigenses ; amongst others, the damnation of St. John Baptist, for having doubted of the coming of Jesus Christ, for they took it for a doubt, in his holy precursor, what he caused his disciples to say to our Saviour, "Art thou he that should come ?" a most extravagant notion, but very conformable to what Faustus, the Manichean, writes, as St. Austin testifies. The other authors who wrote against these new Manicheans, unanimously lay the same error to their charge.

49.— *The same author distinguishes the Vaudois from the Manicheans.*

In the second part of his work, Alanus treats concerning the Vaudois, and there makes a list of their errors, which we shall see in due place; it suffices to observe here, that there is nothing amongst them savouring of Manicheism, and that, at first sight, these two heresies are quite distinct.

---

* Alan. p. 31. Mat. xi. 3. Lib. v. cont. Faust. c. i. Ebrard. Antihær. c. xiii. t. vi. Bib. PP. 1332. Ermeng. c. vi. ibid. 1339, &c.

50.—*Peter of Vaucernay distinguishes mighty well these two sects, and shews the Albigenses are Manicheans.*

That of Waldo was as yet a novelty. It took its rise at Lyons, in the year 1160, and Alanus wrote in 1202, at the beginning of the thirteenth century. A little after, and about the year 1209, Peter of Vaucernay compiled his history of the Albigenses, where, treating on the different sects and heresies of his time, he begins with the Manicheans, and specifies their several parties, wherein are always to be seen some characteristics of those above observed in Manicheism, although in some strained higher, and in others more tempered, according to the fancy of these heretics *. Be that as it will, the whole is bottomed on Manicheism, and this is the peculiar characteristic of that heresy which Vaucernay represents to us in the province of Narbonne, namely, the heresy of the Albigenses, whose history he undertakes. Nothing like this does he attribute to the other heretics of whom he treats. "There were," says he, "other heretics, called Vaudois, from a certain Waldius of Lyons. These doubtless were bad, but nothing in comparison with the first." Then he observes, in few words, four of their capital errors, and immediately after returns to his Albigenses. But these errors of the Vaudois are far remote from Manicheism, as will soon appear; here, then, we have again the Albigenses and Vaudois, two sects thoroughly distinct, and the last clear from any character of Manicheism.

51.—*Peter of Vaucernay in his plain way has well specified the characteristics of the Manicheans.*

The Protestants will have it that Peter of Vaucernay spoke of the Albigensian heresy without well knowing what he said, on account of his charging them with blasphemies which are not to be found even in the Manicheans. But who can answer for all the secrets and new inventions of this abominable sect? What Peter of Vaucernay makes them speak regarding the two Jesus's, whereof one was born in the visible and terrestrial Bethlehem, the other in the celestial and invisible, is much of a piece with the other extravagances of the Manicheans. This invisible Bethlehem does not ill suit with the supernatural Jerusalem, which Peter of Sicily's Paulicians called the mother of God, whence Jesus Christ proceeded †.

---

* Hist. Albi. Pet. Mon. Val-Cern. cap. ii. t. v. Hist. Franc. Duchesn.

† Petr. Sic.

Say what they will of the visible Jesus, that he was not the true Christ, that he was accounted evil by these heretics, I see nothing in all that more extravagant than the other blasphemies of the Manicheans. We meet in Renier with heretics holding something of the principles of the Manicheans, and acknowledging a Christ, son of Joseph and Mary, evil at first and a sinner, but afterwards turned good, and the restorer of their sect *. Certain it is these Manichean heretics were much addicted to change. Renier, one of their number, distinguishes the new from the ancient opinions, and observes many novelties to have arisen amongst them in his time, and since the year 1230 †. Ignorance and extravagance seldom hold long in the same state, and know no bounds in man. However it be, if hatred conceived against the Albigenses made men charge them with Manicheism, or, if you please, something worse than hatred; whence proceeds that care they took to excuse the Vaudois, since it cannot be supposed they were better loved than those, or less declared enemies to the Church of Rome? Yet we have already two authors very zealous for the Catholic doctrine, and very averse to the Vaudois, who carefully distinguish them from the Manichean Albigenses.

52.—*Distinction of the two sects by Ebrard of Bethune.*

Here is also a third not less considerable. It is Ebrard, native of Bethune, whose book, entitled "Anti-heresy," was composed against the heretics of Flanders ‡. These heretics were called Piples or Piphles, in the language of that country. A Protestant author does not conjecture ill, imagining this word Piphles to be a corruption from that of Poplicans; and thence it may be known that these Flemish heretics, like the Poplicans, were perfect Manicheans, nevertheless good Protestants, if we believe the Calvinists, and worthy to be their ancestors. But not to dwell on the other name, we need but give ear to Ebrard, an author of that country, in his description of these heretics. The first characteristic which he gives them is, that they rejected the Law, and the God that gave it; the rest is of the same stamp, they not only despising marriage, but the use of flesh meat, and the sacraments §.

---

* Ren. cont. Wald. c. vi. t. iv. part ii. Bib. PP. p. 753. † Ibid. 759.
‡ Ibid. p. 1075. Pet. de Val-Cern. Ibid. c. ii. La Roq. p. 454.
§ Ibid. c. i. ii. iii. et seq.

53.—*The Vaudois well distinguished from the Manicheans.*

After methodically digesting all he had to say against this sect, he proceeds to speak against that of the Vaudois, which he distinguishes, like the rest, from that of the new Manicheans; and this is the third witness we have to produce*. But here is a fourth, of greater importance in this fact than all the rest.

54.—*Testimony of Renier, who had been of the Sect of Manicheans, in Italy, seventeen years.*

It is Renier, of the order of Dominican friars, from whom we have already cited some passages. He wrote about the year 1250, or 54, and the title he gave his book was, "De Hæreticis, of Heretics," as he testifies in his preface. He styles himself "Brother Renier, formerly an Heresiarch, and now a priest," on account of his having been seventeen years among the Cathari, as he twice acknowledges†. This author is well known among the Protestants, who never cease boasting the fine description he has given of the manners of the Vaudois. He is the more to be credited on the occasion, as he tells us both good and bad with so great sincerity. Now it cannot be alleged he had not a competent knowledge of the several sects of his time. He had been frequently present at the examination of heretics, and there it was that the minutest differences were most narrowly scanned of so many obscure and cunning sects, wherewith Christendom, at that time, was over-run. Many of them were converted, and disclosed all the mysteries of the sect, which had been so carefully concealed. A thorough knowledge of the distemper is half the cure. Over and above this, Renier applied his study to the reading of heretical books, as of that great volume of John of Lyons‡, a leading man amongst the new Manicheans, and from thence extracted the articles of his doctrine which he reports. No wonder, then, this author has given us a more exact account than any other, of the differences in his contemporary sects.

55.—*He distinguishes them mighty well from the Vaudois. The Characteristics of Manicheism in the Cathari.*

The first he instances in is that of the "poor men" of Lyons, descended from Peter Waldo, all whose dogmata he sets down even to the nicest minutiæ. All therein is far remote from Manicheism, as we shall see hereafter. Thence he proceeds to the other sects of the Manichean race; and comes at length to the Cathari, whose secrets he was entirely acquainted with*; for besides his having been, as already observed, seventeen years amongst them, and thoroughly initiated in the sect, he had heard their greatest doctors preach, and amongst others, one called Nazarius, the most ancient of them all, who boasted of having been formed, sixty years before, under the discipline of the two chief pastors of the Bulgarian Church. However, observe this extraction always from Bulgaria. It was from thence the Cathari of Italy, amongst whom Renier dwelt, derived their authority; and as he had been conversant amongst them so many years, it is not to be wondered that he has explained more accurately, and more minutely, their errors, their sacraments, their ceremonies, the different parties formed amongst them, with the affinities as well as the diversities of one from the other. In him, everywhere are to be seen very clearly the principles, the impieties, and the whole spirit of Manicheism. The distinction of the Elect and Auditors, a particular characteristic of the sect, frequent in St. Austin and other authors, is found here distinguished under another name. We learn from Renier, that these heretics, besides the Cathari or Pure, the most consummate of the sect, had also another class which they called "their Believers," made up of all sorts of people†. These were not admitted to all the mysteries; and the same Renier relates that the number of the perfect Cathari, in his time, when the sect was weakened, "did not exceed four thousand in all Christendom;" but "that the believers were innumerable; a computation," says he, "which several times has been made amongst them‡."

---

* Cap. 25.

† Ren. cont. Wal. t. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 746. Pref. Ibid. pp. 746, 756, 757. Ibid. c. vii. p. 765. Ibid. c. iii. p. 748.

‡ Ibid. c. vi. pp. 762, 763.

56.—*A remarkable list of the Manichean Churches.—The Albigenses comprised in it.—All of them descended from Bulgaria.*

Amongst the Sacraments of these heretics, their imposition of hands, in order to remit sins, is chiefly to be observed: they called it consolation; it served both instead of baptism and penance. You see it in the above Council of Orleans, in Ecbert, in Enervin, and in Ermengard. Renier gives the best account of it, as an adept in the mysteries of the sect§. But the most remarkable thing in Renier's book is the exact list of the Churches of the Cathari, and his account of the state they were in at his time. They counted sixteen in all, and amongst the rest he reckons the Church of France, the Church of Toulouse, the Church of Cahors, the Church of Alby; and in fine, the Church of Bulgaria, and the Church of Drunganicia, "whence," says he, "sprung all the rest." This considered, I see not how the Manicheism of the Albigenses can be called in question, nor their descent from the Manicheans of Bulgaria. The reader has but to call to mind the two orders of Bulgaria and Drungaria, mentioned by Vignier's author, and which united themselves in Lombardy. I repeat once more that there is no necessity of searching what this Drungaria can be. These obscure heretics often took their name from unknown places. Renier tells us of Runcarians, a Manichean sect of his time, whose name was taken from a village*. Who knows but this word, Runcarians, was a corruption of Druncarians?

---

* Ren. Ibid. c. v. p. 749, et seq. Ibid. c. vi. pp. 753, 754, 755, 756.

† Ibid. p. 756.

‡ Ibid. p. 759.

§ T. ix. Conc. Ecb. Ren. c. xiv. t. vi. Bib. PP. part i. p. 1254. Ibid. 759.

We find in the same author, and elsewhere, so many different names of these heretics, that it were labour lost to inquire into their origin. Patarians, Poplicans, Toulousians, Albigenses, Cathari, were, under different names, and often with some diversity, in sect Manicheans, all of Bulgarian descent; whence also they took the name most in use among the vulgar.

57.—*The same origin proved from Matthew Paris.—The Pope of the Albigenses in Bulgaria.*

So certain is this origin, that we find it acknowledged even in the thirteenth century. "At this time," says Matthew Paris, (viz. in the year 1223,) "the Albigensian heretics made themselves an Antipope, called Bartholomew, in the confines of Bulgaria, Croatia, and Dalmatia†." It appears afterwards, that the Albigenses went in crowds to consult him; that he had a vicar at Carcassonne and Toulouse, and dispatched his Bishops far and near; which comes up manifestly to what was said by Enervin, that these heretics had their Pope; although the same author informs us that all did not own him. And that no doubt might remain as to the error of the Albigenses, mentioned by Matthew Paris; the same author assures us, "the Albigenses of Spain," that took up arms in 1234, amongst many other errors, "particularly denied the mystery of the incarnation."

---

* Ren. c. xiv. pp. 753, 756.

† Mat. Paris in Henr. III., An. 1223. p. 317. Ep. Enerv. ad S. Bernard. Anal. Mabill. iii. Ibid. 1234. An. p. 395.

58.—*The great hypocrisy of these Heretics from Enervin.*

Notwithstanding such great impieties, the outward appearance of these heretics was surprising. Enervin introduces them, speaking in these terms:—"You, for your part," said they to the Catholics, "join house to house, and field to field: the most perfect amongst you, as the monks and canons regular, if they possess no goods in property, have them at least in common. We, the poor of Jesus Christ, without repose, without settled habitations, wander from town to town like sheep in the midst of wolves, and suffer persecution like the martyrs and apostles*." They boasted next of their abstinence, their fasts, the narrow way they walked in, and called themselves the only followers of the apostolic life, for that, contented with necessaries, they had neither house, nor land, nor riches, "for this reason," said they, "because Jesus Christ neither had, nor possessed the like things, nor suffered his disciples to possess them."

59.—*And from St. Bernard.—Conformity of their discourse with that of Faustus the Manicheans in St. Austin.*

According to St. Bernard, there was "nothing more Christian in appearance" than their speech, nothing more blameless than their manners. Therefore they called themselves the Apostolic, and boasted of leading the lives of the apostles. Methinks, I hear over again Faustus the Manichean, who, in St. Austin, thus speaks to Catholics:—"You ask me whether I receive the gospel? you see I do, inasmuch as I observe what the gospel prescribes: of you I ought to ask whether you receive it, since I see no mark of it in your lives. For my part, I have forsaken father, mother, wife and children, gold, silver, meat, drink, delights, pleasures; content with having what is sufficient for life from day to day. I am poor, I am peaceable, I weep, I suffer hunger and thirst, I am persecuted for justice sake, and do you question whether I receive the gospel†?" After this, must persecutions be still taken for a mark of the true church and true piety? it is the language of Manicheans.

60.—*Their hypocrisy confounded by St. Austin and St. Bernard.*

But St. Austin and St. Bernard shew them that their virtue was nothing but vain ostentation. To carry the abstinence from meats so far as to say that they are unclean and evil in their nature, and continence, even to the condemnation of marriage, is, on the one hand, to attack the Creator, and on the other, loosing the reins to evil desires by leaving them absolutely without a remedy*. Never believe any good of those who run virtue to extremes. The depravation of their minds venting itself in such extravagance of speech, introduces into their lives disorders without end.

---

* Enervin, Anal. iii. p. 454.

† Serm. 65. Serm. 66. L. v. cont. Faust. c. i.

61.—*The infamy of the Heretics and chiefly of the Patarians.*

St. Austin informs us that these people, who debarred themselves of marriage, allowed liberty for every thing else. What, according to their principles, they had an abhorrence of, (I am ashamed to be forced to repeat it,) was properly conception; whence it appears what an inlet was opened to the abominations whereof the old and new Manicheans stand convicted. But, as among the different sects of these new Manicheans there were degrees of weakness, the most infamous of all were those called Patarians; which I the more willingly take notice of, by reason that our Reformed, who place them expressly amongst the Vaudois, glory in descending from them †.

62.—*Doctrine of these Heretics, that the effect of the Sacraments depends on the sanctity of the Ministers.*

Those that make the greatest ostentation of their virtue and the purity of their lives, generally speaking, are the most corrupt. It may have been observed how these impure Manicheans prided themselves, at their beginning, and through the whole progress of the sect, in a virtue more severe than that of others; and with the view of enhancing their own merit, said, that the sacraments and mysteries lost their efficacy in impure hands. It is necessary to take good notice of this part of their doctrine, which we have seen in Enervin, in St. Bernard, and in the Council of Lombez. Wherefore Renier repeats twice, that this imposition of hands, by them called Consolation, and wherein they placed the remission of sins, was unprofitable to the receiver, if the giver of it were in sin, though hidden ‡. Their manner of accounting for this doctrine, according to Ermengard, was, because a person having lost the Holy Ghost, is no longer empowered to give it; which was the very reason alleged by the Donatists of old.

---

* Bern. Serm. 66, in Cant.

† Aug. Ren. c. xvi. Ebrard. c. 26. T. iv. Bib. PP. part. i. p. 1178. Ren. c. vi. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 753. La Roq. Hist. de l'Euc. part ii. c. 18. p. 445.

‡ Ren. c. vi. Ibid. pp. 756, 759. Erm. c. xiv. de imp. Man. Bib. PP. p. 1254.

63.—*They condemn all Oaths and Punishment of Crimes.*

It was moreover for shew of sanctity and to raise themselves above others, that they said, a Christian ought never to affirm the truth by oath for what cause soever, not even in a court of judicature, and that it was unlawful to put any one to death, however criminal. The Vaudois, as we shall see, borrowed from them all these extravagant maxims and all this vain exterior of piety*.

Such were the Albigenses by the testimony of all their contemporary authors, not one excepted. The Protestants blush for them; and all they can answer is, that these excesses, these errors, and all these disorders of the Albigenses, are the calumnies of their enemies. But have they so much as one proof for what they advance, or even one author of those times, and for more than four hundred years after, to support them in it? For our parts, we produce as many witnesses as have been authors in the whole universe who have treated of this sect. Those that were educated in their principles have revealed to us their abominable secrets after their conversion. We trace up the damnable sect even to its source; we shew whence it came, which way it steered its course, all its characteristics, and its whole pedigree branching from the Manichean root. They oppose against us conjectures; nay, what conjectures? We shall take a view of them, for I mean to produce here those that carry the best appearance.

65.—*Examination of Peter de Bruis's doctrine—the Minister's objection taken from Peter of Cluny.*

The greatest effort of our adversaries is in order to justify Peter de Bruis and his disciple Henry. St. Bernard, say they, accuses them of condemning meats and marriage. But Peter, the venerable Abbot of Cluny, who, much about that time, refuted Peter de Bruis, speaks nothing of these errors, and accuses him of five only: of denying infant baptism; of condemning hallowed churches; of breaking crosses, instead of venerating them; of rejecting the eucharist; of ridiculing oblations and prayers for the dead †. St. Bernard avers that this heretic and his followers "received only the Gospel." But venerable Peter speaks doubtingly of it. "Fame," says he,

---

* Bern. Serm. 66, in Cant. Ebrard. c. xiv. xv. Erm. c. xviii. xix. Bib. PP. pp. 1134, 1136, 1260, 1261.

‡ Petr. Ven. con. Petrobr.

" has published that you do not wholly believe either in Jesus Christ, or the Prophets, or the Apostles; but reports, frequently deceitful, are not to be lightly credited, there being some even that say, you reject the whole Canon of the Scriptures *." Whereupon he adds: " I will not blame you for what is uncertain." Here Protestants commend the prudence of venerable Peter, and blame St. Bernard's credulity, as one too easily assenting to confuted reports.

66.—*Peter de Bruis's doctrine according to Peter of Cluny.*

But, in the first place, to take only what the Abbot of Cluny reproves as certain in this heretic, there is more than enough to condemn him. Calvin † has numbered amongst blasphemies the doctrine condemning infant baptism. The denying it, with Peter de Bruis and his disciple Henry, was refusing salvation to the most innocent age of man; it was saying, that for so many ages, during which scarce any were baptized but children, there had been no baptism in the world, no sacrament, no church, no Christians. It is what excited horror in the Abbot of Cluny. The rest of Peter de Bruis's errors, refuted by this venerable author, are not less insupportable. Let us give ear to what he is reproached with in regard of the eucharist by this holy abbot, who hath just declared to us, that he will object nothing to him but what is certain. " He denies," says he, " that the body and blood of Jesus Christ can be made by virtue of the divine word and ministry of the priest, and avers, that all that is done at the altar is unprofitable ‡." This is not only denying the truth of the body and blood, but, like the Manicheans, rejecting absolutely the Eucharist. For which reason the holy abbot subjoins a little after, " Were your heresy contained within the bounds of that of Berengarius, who, in denying the truth of the body, did not deny the sacrament or the appearance and figure of it, I would refer you to the authors that have refuted him. But," proceeds he, a little after, " you add error to error, heresy to heresy; and not only deny the truth of the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, but their sacrament, their figure, and their appearance, and so leave God's people without a sacrifice."

---

* Petr. Ven. T. xxii. Bib. Max. p. 1034. Sermon 65. in Cant. Peter Ven. Ibid. p. 1037.

† Opusc. cont. Servet.

‡ Bib. Mex. p. 107.

67.—*St. Bernard as circumspect as Peter of Cluny.*

As for the errors of which this holy abbot does not speak, and those he doubts of, it is easy to comprehend that the reason of this was, their not being as yet sufficiently proved, nor all the secrets of a sect, which had so many windings and turnings, thoroughly disclosed at the beginning. They came to light by degrees; and venerable Peter assures us himself, that Henry, the disciple of Bruis, had added a great deal to the five chapters condemned in his master*. He had by him the writing wherein all this heresiarch's new errors were collected from his own mouth. But this holy abbot waited, before he refuted them, for still further assurance. St. Bernard, who had beheld these heretics at close view, knew more of them than venerable Peter, who wrote only from report; nor did he know all, and for that reason would not venture to call them complete Manicheans†; for he was not less circumspect than venerable Peter, to impute nothing to them but what was certain. Accordingly, observe how he speaks of their impurities: "Men say, they do shameful things in private‡." "Men say," implies, he had not as yet a full assurance of them, for which reason he durst not speak positively. Those who knew them, have spoken of them; but this circumspection of St. Bernard shews us clearly the certainty of that which he objects to them.

68.—*Answer to the objection regarding the credulity of St. Bernard.*

But, say they, he was credulous, and Otho of Frisingen, an author of the time, has reproached him with it. We must still hear this conjecture, which Protestants lay so much stress on. It is true, Otho of Frisingen finds St. Bernard too credulous, because he caused the manifest errors of Gilbert of Poiree, bishop of Poictiers, to be condemned, whom his disciple Otho endeavoured to excuse. This reproach of Otho is then an excuse, which a fond disciple draws up for his master. Let us see, however, in what he makes the credulity of St. Bernard to consist. "This Abbot," said Otho, "both by the fervour of his faith, and by his natural goodness, had a little too much credulity; so that the doctors, who trusted too much to human reason, and to the wisdom of the age, became suspected by him: and if it was mentioned to him, that their doctrine was not altogether conformable to the faith, he easily believed it*." Was he wrong? Unquestionably not; and experience sufficiently shews that Peter Abelard, who became suspected by him in consequence of this; and Gilbert, who explained the Trinity rather according to the topics of Aristotle than according to tradition and the rule of faith, strayed from the right path, since their errors, condemned in the councils, are equally condemned by Catholics and Protestants.

---

* Ep. ad Episcop. Arelat. &c. Ante Epist. contra Petrob. Bib. Max. p. 1034.

† Sermon 66.

‡ Sermon 65.

69.—*St. Bernard imputes nothing, of which he is not certain, to Peter de Bruis and Henry, the seducers of Toulousians.*

Let us not then here arraign the credulity of St. Bernard. If he have represented to us Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruis, and the seducer of the Toulousians, as the most wicked and the most hypocritical of all men, all writers of the time have passed the same judgment on him. The errors which he attributes to the disciples of these heretics have been acknowledged and discovered by themselves more and more every day, as the sequel of this history will shew. It was not without reason that St. Bernard imputed to them those which we find in his sermons. "I wish," said he, "to recount to you their extravagancies, which we have ascertained, either by the answers which they have given, without intending it, to Catholics, or by the mutual reproaches, which their divisions have caused to burst forth, or by the things which they did, after being converted." Thus, then, those extravagancies were discovered, which St. Bernard subsequently calls blasphemies. When there was nothing else in the Henricans, but their blind attachment for those women, whom they kept in their company, as St. Bernard states, and with whom they spent their lives, shut up in the same room night and day, that were sufficient for their being held in detestation. However, the matter was so public, that St. Bernard wished that they should be known by this mark. "Tell me," said he to them, "my friend, what woman is this? Is she your wife?"—"No," say they, "that suits not my profession." "Is she your daughter, your sister, your niece?"—"No; she is no way related to me." —"But do you know that it is not allowed, according to the laws of the church, to those who have professed continence, to cohabit with women? Put her away, then, if you wish not to scandalise the church; otherwise, this fact, which is manifest, will make us suspect the rest, which is not so much so."

---

* Albert. La Roq. Otho. Fris. in Frid. c. 46, 47.

He was not too credulous in this suspicion, and the turpitude of these pretendedly chaste individuals has since been disclosed to the entire world.

70.—*Conclusion.*

Whence comes it then, that Protestants undertake the defence of these wicked men? The reason is too obvious. It is their ambition to procure themselves predecessors. They find none others who reject the worship of the cross, the prayers of the saints, and oblations for the dead. They are annoyed at finding the commencement of their reformation only among the Manicheans. Because they grumble against the pope and the church of Rome, the reformation is well disposed in their favour. The Catholics of that time reproach them with their bad notions concerning the Eucharist. Our Protestants would have been glad if they had been but mere Berengarians, displeased with the Eucharist in part, not Manicheans, averse to it in the whole. But though it had been so, these reformed, whom you will have your brethren, concealed their doctrine, "frequented our churches, honoured priests, went to the oblation; confessed their sins, communicated, received with us," continues St. Bernard, "the body and blood of Jesus Christ*." Behold them, therefore, in our assemblies, which in their hearts they detested as the conventicles of Satan; present at mass, which, in their error, they accounted an idolatry and sacrilege; and, in short, practising the usages of the church of Rome, which they believed was the kingdom of Antichrist. Are these the disciples of Him, who commanded his gospel to be preached on the house-tops? Are these the children of light? Are these the works which shine forth before men, or rather such as should be hid in darkness? In a word, are these fit fathers for the Reformation to choose and boast of?

A HISTORY OF THE VAUDOIS.

71.—*Beginning of the Vaudois, or Poor Men of Lyons.*

The Vaudois serve them no better with regard to establishing a legitimate succession. Their name is derived from Waldo, the author of the sect. Lyons was the place of their nativity. They were called the "poor men" of Lyons, on account of the poverty affected by them; and as the city of Lyons was then called, in Latin, Leona, they had also the appellation of Leonists, or Lionists.

---

* Sermon 65, in Cant. Ecbert. Ren.

72.—*The names of the Sect.*

They were also called the Insabbatized, from an ancient word signifying shoes, whence have proceeded other words of a like signification, still in use in several other languages as well as ours[*]. They took, therefore, the name of the Insabbatized from a sort of shoes of a particular make, which they cut in the upper part, to shew their feet naked like the Apostles, as they said; and this fashion was affected by them in token of their apostolic poverty.

73.—*Their History bipartite.—Their beginnings specious.*

Now, here is an abridgment of their history. At their first separation, they held but few tenets contrary to ours, if any at all. In the year 1160, Peter Waldo, a merchant of Lyons, at a meeting held, as customary, with the other rich traders of the town, was so lively struck with the sudden death of one of the most eminent amongst them, that he immediately distributed all his means, which were considerable, to the poor of that city; and having, on that account, gathered a great number of them, he preached to them voluntary poverty, and the imitation of the life of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. This is what Renier says, whom the Protestants, pleased with the encomiums we shall find he bestows on the Vaudois, will have us believe in this matter preferably to all other authors[†]. But we are going to see, what misguided piety can arrive to. Peter Pylicdorf, who beheld the Vaudois in their most flourishing condition, and related, not only their dogmata, but deportment too, with much simplicity and learning, says, that Waldo, moved with those words of the gospel so highly favourable to poverty, believed the apostolic life was no longer to be found on earth. Bent on restoring it, he sold all he had. "Others, touched with compunction, did the same," and united together in this undertaking[‡]. At the first rise of this obscure and timorous sect, either they had none, or did not publish any particular tenet; which was the reason that Ebrard of Bethune remarks nothing singular in them but the affectation of a proud and lazy poverty[§]. One might see these Insabbatized or Sabbatized, so he calls them, with their naked feet, or rather with "their shoes cut open" at top, waiting for alms, and living only on what was given them[||]. Nothing was blamed in them, at first, but ostentation, and, without ranking them as yet amongst heretics, they were reproached only with imitating their pride*. But let us hear the sequel of their history: "After living a while in this pretended apostolic poverty, they bethought themselves that the Apostles were not only poor, but also preached the gospel†." They set themselves, therefore, to preach, according to their example, that they might wholly imitate the apostolic life. But the apostles were sent; and these men, whose ignorance rendered them incapable of such mission, were excluded by the prelates, and lastly, by the Holy See, from a ministry which they had usurped without their leave. Nevertheless, they continued it in private, and murmured against the clergy, that hindered them from preaching, as they said, through jealousy, and on account that their doctrine and holy life cast a reproach on the corrupt manners of the others‡.

---

[*] Ebrard. Ibid. c. 25. Conrad. Ursper. Chron. ad An. 1212.

[†] Ren. c. v. p. 749.

[‡] Lib. cont. Wal. c. i. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 779.

[§] Antih. c. 25. Bib. Max.. 1168.

[||] Ibid.

74.—*Whether Waldo were a man of learning.*

Some protestants have asserted, that Waldo was a man of learning; but Renier says only, "he had a small tincture of it;" *aliquantulum literatus* §. Other protestants, on the contrary, take advantage from the great success he had in his ignorance. But it is but too well known, what a dexterity often may be met with in the minds of the most ignorant men, to attract to them those that are alike disposed, and Waldo seduced none but such.

75.—*The Vaudois condemned by Lucius III.*

This sect, in little time, made a great progress. Bernard, abbot of Fontcauld, who saw their beginnings, remarks their increase under Pope Lucius III‖. This Pope's pontificate commences in 1181, to wit, twenty years after Waldo had appeared at Lyons. Twenty years at least were requisite to make a body and so considerable a sect as to deserve notice. At that time, therefore, Lucius III. condemned them; and as his pontificate held but four years, this first condemnation of the Vaudois must have fallen between the year 1181, when this Pope was raised to St. Peter's chair, and the year 1185, wherein he died.

76.—*They come to Rome.—They are not accused of any thing in respect to the Real Presence.*

Conrade, abbot of Ursperg, thoroughly acquainted, as we shall find, with the Vaudois, has written, that Pope Lucius placed them in the number of heretics, on account of some dogmata and superstitious observances. As yet these dogmata are not specified; but there is no question, that, if the Vaudois had denied such remarkable points as that of the Real Presence (a matter become so notorious by Berengarius's condemnation,) it had not been thought sufficient to say in general, they held "some superstitious dogmata *."

---

* Bib. p. 1170. † Pylicd. ib. ‡ Pylicd. ib. Ren. ib. § Ren. c. vi.
‖ Bern. Abb. Fontiscal. adv. Wald. Sect. T. iv. Bib. PP. Præf. p. 1195.

77.—*Another proof that their errors did not regard the Eucharist.*

Much about the same time, in the year 1194, a statute of Alphonsus or Ildephonsus, king of Arragon, reckons the Vaudois or Insabbatized, otherwise the poor men of Lyons, amongst heretics anathematized by the Church, and this is manifestly in consequence of the sentence pronounced by Lucius III. After this Pope's death, when in spite of his decree these heretics spread themselves far and near, and Bernard, archbishop of Narbonne, who condemned them anew after a great inquest, could not stem the current of their progress, many pious persons, Ecclesiastics and others, procured a conference, in order to reclaim them in an amicable manner. "Both sides agreed to choose for umpire" in the conference, a holy priest called Raimond of Daventry, "a man illustrious for birth, but much more so for the holiness of his life." The assembly was very solemn, "and the dispute held long." Such passages of Scripture, as each party grounded itself on, were produced on both sides. The Vaudois were condemned, and declared heretics in regard to all the heads of accusation †.

78.—*Proof of the same truth by a famous Conference, wherein all points were discussed.*

Thence it appears that the Vaudois, though condemned, had not as yet broken all measures with the church of Rome, in as much as they had agreed to the umpirage of a Catholic and priest. The abbot of Fontcauld, present at the conference, did commit to writing, with much judgment and perspicuity, the debated points, and the passages alleged on both sides: so that nothing can give us a clearer insight into the whole state of the question, such as it then was, and at the beginning of the sect.

---

* Chron. ad An. 1212.

† Apud Em. p. ii. direct. inq. q. xiv. p. 287. et apud Marian. Præf. in Luc. Trid. t. iv. Bib. PP. ii. p. ii. p. 582. Bern. de Font. Cal. adversus Wal. Sect. in Præf. t. iv. Bib. PP. p. iii. p. 1195.

79.—*Articles of the Conference.*

The dispute chiefly turned on the obedience due to pastors. It is plain, the Vaudois refused it, and, notwithstanding all their prohibitions, believed they had a right to preach, both men and women. As this disobedience could be grounded on nothing else but the pastor's unworthiness, the Catholics, in proving the obedience due to them, prove it is due even to the wicked, and that grace, be its channel what it will, never ceases to diffuse itself on the faithful[*]. For the same reason they shewed, that slandering of pastors (whence was taken the pretext of disobedience) was forbidden by the laws of God[†]. Then they attack the liberty, which laymen gave themselves, of preaching without the pastors' leave, nay in spite of their prohibitions, and shew, that this seditious preaching tends to the subversion of the weak and ignorant[‡]. Above all, they prove from the Scripture[§], that women, to whom silence is enjoined, ought not to interfere in teaching[||]. Lastly, it is remonstrated to the Vaudois, how much they are in the wrong, to reject prayer for the dead, so well grounded in Scripture, and so evidently handed down by tradition: and, whereas these heretics absented from churches in order to pray apart in their houses, they are made sensible, that they ought not to abandon the house of prayer, whose sanctity the whole Scripture and the Son of God himself had so much recommended.

80.—*The Eucharist is not there spoken of.*

Without examining here which side was right or wrong in this debate, it is plain, what was the ground of it, and which were the points contested; and it is more clear than day, that in these beginnings, far from bringing the real presence, transubstantiation, or the sacraments into question, they did not as yet so much as mention praying to saints, nor relics, nor images.

81.—*Alanus, who makes a list of the errors of the Vaudois, objects nothing concerning the Eucharist.*

It was nearly about this time, that Alanus wrote the book above-mentioned; wherein, after carefully distinguishing the Vaudois from the other heretics of his time, he undertakes to prove, in opposition to their doctrine, "That none ought to preach without mission; that prelates should be obeyed, and not only good, but also evil ones; that their bad lives derogate not from their power: that it is to the sacred order we ought to attribute the power of consecrating and that of binding and loosing, and not to personal merit; that we ought to confess to priests, and not to laymen; that it is lawful to swear in certain cases, and to execute malefactors *." This is much what he opposes to the errors of the Vaudois. Had they erred in relation to the Eucharist, Alanus would not have forgotten it, the very thing he was so mindful to reproach the Albigenses with, against whom he undertakes to prove both the real presence and transubstantiation; and after reproving so many things of less importance in the Vaudois, he would never have omitted so essential a point.

---

[*] c. 1, 2.
[†] Ib. c. 3.
[‡] Ib. c. 4. et seq.
[§] Ib. c. 7.
[||] Ib. c. 8. c. 9.

82.—*Nor Peter de Vaucernay.*

A little after Alanus's time, and about the year 1201, Peter de Vaucernay, a plain downright man, and of unquestionable sincerity, distinguishes the Vaudois from the Albigenses by their proper characters, when he tells us, "the Vaudois were bad, but much less so than these other heretics," who admitted the two principles, and all the consequences of that damnable doctrine †. "Not to mention," proceeds this author, "their other infidelities; their error chiefly consisted in four heads: *viz.* their wearing sandals in imitation of the Apostles; their saying it was not lawful to swear for whatsoever cause; nor to put to death, even malefactors; lastly, in that they said that each one of them, though but mere laymen, provided he wore sandals (namely, as above seen, the mark of apostolic poverty) might consecrate the body of Jesus Christ." Here are in reality the specific characters that denote the true spirit of the Vaudois; the affectation of poverty in the sandals which were the badge of it; simplicity and apparent meekness in rejecting all oaths and capital punishments, and, what was more peculiar to this sect, the belief that the laity, provided they had embraced their pretended apostolic poverty and bore its badge, that is, provided they were of their sect, might administer and consecrate the Sacraments, even the body of Jesus Christ. The rest, as their doctrine concerning prayer for the dead, was comprised in the other infidelities of these heretics, which this author forbears to particularize. Yet, had they risen up against the real presence, since the disturbance this matter had caused in the church, not only this religious would not have forgotten it, but had been far from saying, "they consecrated the body of Jesus Christ," thereby making them not to differ from Catholics in this point, except their attributing to laymen that power, which Catholics acknowledged only in the priesthood.

---

* Alan. lib ii. p. 175, et seq. Lib. i. p. 118, et seq.

† Pet. de Val.-Cern. Hist. Albig. c. 2. Duch. Hist. Fran. t. v. p. 575.

83.—*The Vaudois come to demand the approbation of Innocent III.*

It appears then manifestly, that the Vaudois in 1209, at the time of Peter de Vaucernay's writing, had not so much as thought of denying the real presence, but retained so much either true or apparent submission to the church of Rome, that even in 1212, they came to Rome, in order to obtain "the approbation of their sect from the Holy See." It was then that Conrade, Abbot of Ursperg*, saw them there, as he himself reports, with their master Bernard. They may be discovered by the characters given them by this chronicler: they were "the poor men of Lyons, those whom Lucius III. had put in the list of heretics," who made themselves remarkable by the affectation "of apostolic poverty, with their shoes cut open at top;" who in "their private preaching and clandestine assemblies reviled the church and priesthood." The Pope judged the affectation was very odd which they discovered "in these cut shoes, and in their capuches, like those of the religious, though, contrary to their custom, they wore a long head of hair like laymen." And truly, these strange affectations most commonly cover something bad; but especially men took offence at the liberty these new apostles gave themselves of going promiscuously together, men and women, in imitation, as they said, of the pious women that followed Jesus Christ and the apostles to minister to them; but very different were the times, the persons, and the circumstances.

84.—*The Vaudois begin to be treated like obstinate heretics.*

It was, says the Abbot of Ursperg, with the design of giving to the Church men truly poor, more divested of earthly goods than these false poor of Lyons, that the Pope afterwards approved the institute of the Brother-Minors, assembled under the direction of St. Francis, the true pattern of humility, and miracle of the age; whilst these other poor, fraught with hatred against the Church and her ministers, notwithstanding their fallacious humility, were rejected by the Holy See; insomuch that, afterwards, they were treated as contumacious and incorrigible heretics. Yet they made a shew of submission till the year 1212, which was the fifteenth of Innocent III., and fifty years since their beginning.

---

* Conr. Ursperg. ad An. 1212.

85.—*The Church's patience in regard to the Vaudois.*

Thence a judgment may be formed of the Church's patience with respect to these heretics, using no rigour against them for fifty years together, but endeavouring to reclaim them by conferences. Besides that mentioned by Bernard, Abbot of Fontcauld, we also find another in Peter de Vaucernay*, about the year 1206, where the Vaudois were confounded; and lastly in 1212, when, on their coming again to Rome, the Church proceeded no further against them than by rejecting their imposture. Three years after, Innocent III. held the great Council of Lateran, where, in his condemnation of heretics, he particularly takes notice of "those, who, under pretext of piety, arrogate to themselves the authority of preaching without mission;" whereby he seems to have particularly pointed out the Vaudois and distinguished them by the origin of their schism.

86.—*The Sect of the Vaudois a species of Donatism.*

Here are seen evidently the beginnings of this sect. It was a kind of Donatism, but different from that impugned of old in Africa, in that the African Donatists, making the effect of the sacraments depend on the virtue of the ministers, reserved at least the power of conferring them to holy priests and bishops; whereas these new Donatists attributed it, as above seen, to laymen whose life was pure. Nor did they come to this excess but by degrees; for at first they allowed nothing to the laity but preaching. They not only reproved evil manners, which the Church no less condemned than they, but also many other things she approved of, as ceremonies, yet so as not to touch on the sacraments: for Pylicdorf†, who was very accurate in observing both the ancient spirit and the whole progress of the sect, observes that they discarded every thing employed by the Church to edify the faithful, "except," says he‡, "the sacraments alone;" which shews, they left them untouched. The same author relates, moreover, "that it was a long while before they began, being laymen, to hear confessions, to enjoin penances, and give absolution; and it has been observed but a little time since," continues this author, "that one of these heretics, a mere layman, did consecrate, according to his notion, our Lord's body, and communicated himself, together with his accomplices, although somewhat reprimanded for it by the rest."

---

* Pet. de Val. c. 6, p. 561. Conc. Lat. iv. Can. 3, de Hæret.
† Pet. Pylicid. cont. Wald. c. i. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 780. ‡ Ibid.]

87.—*Their presumption increased by little and little.*

See how their presumption increased by degrees. The followers of Waldo, scandalized at the lives of several priests, "believed themselves," says the same Pylicdorf, better absolved by their own people, seemingly to them more virtuous, than by the ministers of the Church*, which proceeded from the opinion, wherein principally consisted the error of the Vaudois, that personal merit had greater influence in the sacraments than character and order.

88.—*The Vaudois doctrine concerning Church goods.*

But the Vaudois carried the merit necessary to Ministers of the Church so far as to have nothing in property; and this was one of their dogmata, that to consecrate the Eucharist, it was requisite to be poor like them: so "that Catholic priests were not the true and legitimate successors of Jesus Christ's apostles, because they possessed goods of their own†;" which they pretended Jesus Christ had forbidden his apostles.

89.—*No error relating to the Sacraments.*

Hitherto their whole error, in respect to the sacraments, regarded only the persons empowered to administer them; all the rest was left entire, as says expressly Pylicdorf. So they doubted not either of the real presence, or transubstantiation; and, on the contrary, this author has but just informed us, that the layman presuming to give communion, did only believe "he had consecrated the body of Jesus Christ." After all, by the manner we have seen this heresy begin, it seems as if Waldo had a good design at first; that the glory of poverty which he boasted of, did seduce both him and his followers; that, puffed up with the holiness of their lives, they swelled with a bitter zeal against the clergy, and whole Catholic

---

* Pet. Pylicid. cont. Wald. c. i. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 780.
† V. sup. Pet. de Valle-Cern. Refut. Error. Ibid. p. 819.

Church*; that, exasperated with their being prohibited to preach, they fell into schism, and, as Gui says, " from schism into heresy."

90.—*Manifest insincerity of Protestant Historians, and of Paul Perrin, concerning the beginnings of the Vaudois.*

From this faithful account, and the incontestable proofs with which it is manifestly supported, it is easy to judge how much Protestant historians have abused the public credit by their relation of their origin of the Vaudois. Paul Perrin, author of their history printed at Geneva, says, that in the year 1160, when the penalty of death was denounced against all who should disbelieve the Real Presence, " Peter Waldo, a citizen of Lyons, was one of the most courageous in opposing such an invention †." But nothing is more false; the article of the Real Presence had been defined a hundred years before, against Berengarius: nothing had been done anew relating to this article; and so far from Waldo's opposing it, we have seen both him and all his disciples in the common faith for fifty years together.

91.—*The Minister de la Roque.*

Mr. de la Roque ‡, more learned than Perrin, is not more sincere, when he says, " that Peter Waldo, having found whole nations divided from the communion of the Latin Church, joined himself to them with his followers, in order to make but one and the same body, and one and the same society, by the unity of one and the same doctrine." But, on the contrary, we have seen, in the first place, that all the contemporary authors (for not one have we omitted) have shewn us the Vaudois and Albigenses as two distinct sects; secondly, that all these authors discover these Albigenses to be Manicheans; and I defy all the Protestants in the world to shew me that there was anywhere in Europe, when Waldo arose, any one sect separate from Rome which was not either the very sect, or some branch and subdivision of Manicheism. Thus, nothing can make Waldo's cause more evidently defenceless, than to grant his abettors what they demand in his behalf, namely, that he joined himself in unity of doctrine with the Albigenses, or with such people as, at that time, were separated from the communion of Rome. In a word, though Waldo should have united himself to guiltless churches, his particular errors would not have allowed any advantage to be drawn from this union, these errors being detested, not by Catholics only, but also by the Protestants.

---

* Guid. Car. de Hær. in Hæresi Wald. init.

† Hist. des Vaudois, chap. i.

‡ Hist. de l'Euch. part ii. ch. xviii. p. 454.

92.—*Whether the Vaudois afterwards changed their Doctrine about the Eucharist.*

But let us proceed in the history of the Vaudois, and see whether our Protestants will discover in it anything more favourable from the time these heretics broke off entirely from the Church. The first act we meet with against the Vaudois, since the great Council of Lateran, is a Canon of the Council of Tarragona, describing the Insabbatized, as men "that forbad to swear, and obey ecclesiastic and secular powers, and moreover to punish malefactors, and other such like things*," not the least word appearing in regard of the Real Presence, which not only would have been expressed, but also set foremost, had they denied it.

93.—*Proof of the contrary from Renier.*

At the same time, and towards the year 1250, Renier, so often quoted, who so carefully distinguishes the Vaudois or Leonists and the poor men of Lyons, from the Albigenses, sets down moreover all their errors, reducing them to these three heads: against the Church, against the Sacraments and Saints, and against Church Ceremonies†. But so far from anything appearing in all these articles against transubstantiation, you there find expressly, amongst their errors, that "transubstantiation ought to be made in the vulgar tongue; that a priest could not consecrate in mortal sin;" that when a man communicated from the hand of an unworthy priest, the transubstantiation was not made in his hand that consecrated unworthily, but in the mouth of him who worthily received the Eucharist; that one might consecrate at table, at common meals, and not in churches only, conformably to those words of Malachi, "In every place there is sacrificing, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation‡:" which shews, they did not deny the sacrifice nor the oblation of the Eucharist: and that, if they rejected the mass, it was on account of the ceremonies, making it only to consist in "the words of Jesus Christ pronounced in the vulgar tongue§." Thence it clearly appears, that they admitted transubstantiation, and in nothing differed from the Church's doctrine as to the substance of this Sacrament: but said only, that it could not be consecrated by evil priests, and might be by good laymen, according to these fundamental maxims of their sect, which Renier is always exact in observing, "that every good layman is a priest, and the prayer of an evil priest availed nothing[*]:" whence also they concluded, the consecration by an evil priest is worth nothing. It is likewise to be seen in other authors, that, according to their principles[†], "a man, without being a priest, might consecrate and administer the sacrament of penance; and every laic, even women, ought to preach."

---

* Conc. Tarrac. t. xi. Conc. part i. An. 1242. p. 593.

† Ren. c. v. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 749. Ibid. 750.

‡ Malach. i. 11.

§ Ren. Ibid.

94.—*A list of the Vaudois errors.*

We find also in the catalogue of their errors, as well in Renier as other authors, "that it is not lawful for clergymen," namely, the ministers of the Church[‡], "to have goods; that neither lands, nor people, ought to be divided;" which aims at the obligation of setting all in common, and establishing, as necessary, this pretended apostolic poverty, which these heretics gloried in[§]; "that every oath is a mortal sin; that all princes and judges are damned, because they condemn malefactors contrary to these words[||]: 'Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord;' and again, 'Let both grow together until the harvest[¶].'" Thus did these hypocrites abuse the Scripture, and with their counterfeited lenity subvert the whole foundation of Church and State.

95.—*Another list, and no mention of their erring in regard of the Eucharist.*

We find in Pylicdorf, a hundred years after, an ample refutation of the Vaudois, article by article, without appearance of the least opposition in their doctrine to the Real Presence or transubstantiation. On the contrary, it always appears in this author, as in the rest, that the laymen of this sect made the body of Jesus Christ[**], although with fear and reserve in the country wherein he wrote; nor, in short, does he observe any kind of error in these heretics relating to the Eucharist, except, that evil priests did not make it "any more than the other Sacraments."

---

[*] Ren. p. 751.

[†] Fragm. Pylicd. Ibid. 817. Ren. Ibid. p. 751.

[‡] Ren. p. 750 Ibid. err. 820.

[§] Ibid. p. 752.

[||] Ind. err. Ibi. 831. 9. 23

[¶] Rom. xii. 19. Matth. xiii 30.

[**] Pylicd. cont. Wald. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. 778. et seq. An. 1395. Ibid. c. xxx. p. 803. Ibid. c. i. Ibid. c. xvi. xviii.

96.—*Another list.*

Finally, in all the lists we have of their errors, whether in the Bibliotheca Patrum*, or in the Inquisitor Emerick, we meet with nothing against the Real Presence, although the least differences between these heretics and us, the minutest articles whereon they are to be interrogated, be there specified ; on the contrary, Emerick the Inquisitor thus reports their error on the Eucharist : " They will have it that the bread is not transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, if the priest be a sinner†:" which clearly evidences two things ; first, that they believed transubstantiation ; and secondly, believed the sacraments depended on the sanctity of the ministers.

You find in the same list all the errors of the Vaudois we have already mentioned. The errors of the new Manicheans, whom we have shewn were the same with those of the Albigenses, are also related apart in the same book. It is plain from thence, that these two sects are utterly distinct, nor is there anything amongst the errors of the Vaudois that savours of Manicheism, which the other list abounds with.

97.—*Demonstration that the Vaudois did not in the least err about Transubstantiation.*

But to return to Transubstantiation : whence could it proceed, that the Catholics should have spared the Vaudois in a point of so essential a nature, they who were so zealous in exposing even the least of their errors‡? Was it perchance that these matters, and especially that of the Eucharist, were not of sufficient importance, or not sufficiently known, after Berengarius's condemnation by so many councils ? Was it the desire of keeping the people ignorant that this mystery was attacked? But they were not afraid to report the much greater blasphemies of the Albigenses, even against this mystery. Nothing was concealed from the people of what the Vaudois said, the most shocking against the Church of Rome, as that she was " the harlot mentioned in the Revelations ; her Pope, the chief of those that erred ; her prelates and religious, scribes and pharisees." Their excesses were pitied, but never kept private ; and had they rejected the Church's faith in regard of the Eucharist, they would have been upbraided with it.

---

* Bib. PP. t. iv. part ii. p. 820, 832, 836.

† Director. part ii. q. 14. p. 279. Ibid. p. xiii. p. 273.

‡ Rea. c. iv. Ibid. 750. Emeric. Ibid.

98.—*Sequel of the same demonstration.—Testimony of Claude Seyssel in* 1517.—*Gross evasion of D'Aubertin.*

Further, in the last age, in 1517. Claude Seyssel *, famous for his learning and offices of trust, held under Louis XII. and Francis I., and raised by his merit to the Archbishopric of Turin ; in the search he made after these heretics, hidden in the valleys of his diocese, in order to unite them to his flock, relates in the minutest manner all their errors, like a faithful shepherd willing to know the bottom of the distemper afflicting his sheep, that he might heal them ; and we read in his account all that other writers relate of them, neither more nor less. With them he chiefly observes, as the source of their error, that " they made the authority of ecclesiastical ministry to depend on personal merit ; thence concluding, that they ought not to obey the Pope, nor Bishops, because being wicked, and not imitating the lives of the apostles, they have no authority from God, either to consecrate, or absolve ; and as to themselves, they alone had this power, because they observed the law of Jesus Christ, that the Church was no where but amongst them, and the See of Rome was that harlot of the Revelations, and the fountain-head of all errors." This is what that great Archbishop says of the Vaudois in his diocese. The minister Aubertin † is astonished that in so exact an account as he gives of their errors, it is not discovered, that they rejected either the Real Presence or Transubstantiation ; nor any other reply can he make to it, than that this prelate, who had so strenuously confuted them in all other points, was, in this, conscious of his too great weakness to resist them : as if so learned and eloquent a man could not at least transcribe what so many other learned Catholics had written on this subject. Instead, therefore, of so miserable a shift, Aubertin ought to have acknowledged, that if so accurate, so knowing a person, did not reproach the Vaudois with this error, it was in reality because he had discovered none such amongst them : wherein there is nothing particular as to Seyssel, since all the other authors have no more accused them of it than this Archbishop.

* Adv. error. Wald. part. An. 1520. f. i. et seq. Ibid. f. 10. 11.

† Lib. iii. de Sacr. Euch. p. 986. Col. 2. Ibid. 987.

99.—*Aubertin's vain objection.*

Nevertheless, Aubertin triumphs at a passage of the same Seyssel, where he says*, "He did not think it worth his while to relate what some of that sect, to shew themselves more learned than the rest, prattled, or rallied, rather than discoursed, concerning the substance and truth of the Eucharistic Sacrament, because, what they vented by way of secret, was so high, that the most expert divines could scarce comprehend it." But so far are these words of Seyssel from shewing the Real Presence was denied by the Vaudois, that I should, on the contrary, conclude from them, that some amongst them pretended to subtilize in expounding it. And should it be allowed (yet gratuitously and without any kind of reason, since Seyssel speaks not a word of it) that these high notions entertained by the Vaudois, relating to the Eucharist, regarded the real absence, to wit, a thing the least sublime of any in the world, and the most suited to carnal sense; yet then, it is nevertheless manifest that Seyssel does not report here the belief of all, but the babble and idle discourse of some: so that, on all hands, nothing is more certain than what I have advanced, that the Vaudois never were reproached with rejecting transubstantiation; but, on the contrary, had always been supposed to believe it.

100.—*Another proof from Seyssel that the Vaudois believed Transubstantiation.*

Accordingly the same Seyssel†, introducing a Vaudois summing up all his reasons, puts these words into his mouth against a wicked priest and bishop: "How can the bishop and priest, enemies to God, render God propitious to others? how can he, that is banished the kingdom of Heaven, have the keys of it? in fine, since his prayer and other actions have no manner of effect, how shall Jesus Christ transform himself, at his word, under the species of bread and wine, and suffer himself to be handled by that person, who has utterly rejected him?" It is then still manifest, their error consists in a Donatism, and nothing but a priest's life hinders the bread and wine from being changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

---

* Fol. 55, 56. † F. 13.

101.—*Interrogatory of the Vaudois in the library of the Marquis of Seignelay.—Two Volumes marked* 1769, 1770.

And what leaves no kind of doubt on this head is, what may be seen still at this day among the manuscripts of Mr. de Thou, collected together in the valuable library of the Marquis of Seignelay; there, I say, may be seen the inquests, in the original, juridically made against the Vaudois of Pragelas and the other valleys in 1495, collected in two great volumes; wherein you have the examination of one Thomas Quoti of Pragelas, who being asked whether the barbes (their priests) taught them to believe the sacrament of the altar, answers, "That the barbes both preach and teach that when a chaplain who is in orders, utters the words of consecration on the altar, he consecrates the body of Jesus Christ, and that a true change is wrought of the bread into the true body," and says, moreover, "that prayer made at home, or on the road, is every whit as good as in the church." Conformably to this doctrine, the same Quoti answers at two several times, "That he received every year, at Easter, the body of Jesus Christ; and the barbes taught them, that, in order to receive it, they ought to have been well confessed, and rather by the barbes than by the chaplains," meaning the priests.

102.—*Sequel of the same Examination.*

The reason of this preference is derived from the so often repeated principles of the Vaudois; and it is pursuant to these principles the same person answers, "that the gentlemen of the church-ministry led a life too large, but the barbes led a holy and upright life." And in another answer, "that the barbes led the life of St. Peter, and had the power of absolving from sins, and this was his belief; and if the Pope did not lead a holy life, he had no power of absolving." For this reason, the same Quoti answers again in another place, "that he had given credit, without any doubting, rather to the discourses of the barbes than to those of the chaplains, because, in those times, no ecclesiastic, no cardinal, no bishop, nor priest, led the life of the apostles; and, therefore, it was better believing the barbes who were good, than an ecclesiastic that was not so."

103.—*Sequel.*

It were superfluous to relate the other examinations, the same language appearing throughout, as well in respect of the Real

Presence as of all the rest; and especially it is repeated there continually, "that the barbes behaved in the world like the imitators of Jesus Christ, and had more power than the priests of the Church of Rome, who lived too much at large."

104.—*Necessity of Confession.*

Nothing is repeated there so much as these dogmata, "That you ought to confess your sins; that they confessed to the barbes, who had power of absolving them; that they confessed kneeling; that at each confession they gave a quart (a certain piece of money); that the barbes imposed penances on them which generally did not exceed a Pater and Credo, but the Ave Mary was never enjoined; that they forbad them all oaths whatsoever, and taught them neither to sue for help from the saints, nor to pray for the dead." Here is enough whereby to discover the principal tenets and genius of the sect; further than this, to expect to meet with order and one constant form in such odd opinions, in all times and all places, were to be deceived.

105.—*Sequel of the same Subject.*

I do not find they were interrogated concerning sacraments administered by the generality of laymen, whether because the inquisitors were not apprised of this custom, or that the Vaudois had at length forsaken it*. And, indeed, we have observed, it was not without difficulty and contradiction first introduced amongst them with regard to the Eucharist. But, as for confession, nothing is more established in the sect, than the right good laymen have to it: "A good layman," said they, "has power to absolve; they all gloried in forgiving sins by imposition of hands; they heard confessions; enjoined penances; and lest such an extraordinary practice should be discovered, they very privately received confessions, and those of women even, in cellars, in caverns, and other unfrequented places; they preached clandestinely in corners of houses, and often in the night-time."

106.—*The Vaudois exteriorly did the Duties of Catholics.*

But what cannot be too much remarked is, that although they had such an opinion of us as we have seen, yet they frequented our assemblies: "There they offer," says Renier[*], "there they confess, there they communicate, but with dissimulation." The reason was, in short, whatever they might say[†], because "some distrust remained in them of the communion they practised among themselves." Wherefore, "they came to communicate in the church when the throng was greatest, for fear of discovery. Many also remained even four, nay, six years, without communicating, concealing themselves either in villages, or towns, at Easter time, lest notice should be taken of them. They also judged it advisable to communicate in the church, but at Easter only, and, under this appearance, they passed for Christians." This is what the ancient authors say of them[‡], and what also frequently may be found in the interrogatories above-mentioned. "Being asked whether he made his confession to the parish priest, and discovered his sect to him, his answer was, that he confessed yearly to him, but did not mention his being a Vaudois, which the barbes had forbid discovering." They answer also as above, "that every year they communicated at Easter, and received the body of Jesus Christ; and that the barbes warned them of the necessity, before they received, of having made a good confession." Observe, there is no mention here made but of the body alone, and of one only species; as, since the Council of Constance, it was then given over all the Church, the barbes never thinking all this while of condemning it. An old author[§] has observed, "They very rarely received from their teachers either baptism or Christ's body, but as well teachers as simple believers went to seek them at the priest's hands." Nor, indeed, do we conceive how they could have acted otherwise, in regard to baptism, without discovering themselves, for it would soon have been taken notice of, had they not brought their children to church, for which they would have been called to an account. Thus, separated in sentiments from the Catholic Church, these hypocrites, as far as they were able, shewed themselves externally of the same faith with others, and exhibited no act of religion in public which did not belie their doctrine.

---

* Pylicd. c. i. T. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 780. Ind. Err. Ibid. p. 832. N. 12. Ren. Ibid. 750. Pylicd. Ibid. c. i. p. 780. Ibid. c. viii. p. 782. 820.

---

[*] Ren. Ibid. c. v. p. 752. Ibid. vii. p. 765.

[†] Ind. Err. N. 12, 13. Ibid. p. 832.

[‡] Pylicd. c. xxv. Ibid 796. Interrogat. of Quoti and others. Ibid.

[§] Pylicd. Ibid. c. xxiv. p. 796.

107.—*Whether the Vaudois had discarded any one of the Seven Sacraments.—Confirmation.*

The Protestants may perceive by this example what kind of men those hidden faithful before the Reformation were, whom they extol so much, and who had not bent a knee to Baal. It might be doubted whether the Vaudois had discarded any of the Seven Sacraments. And it is already manifest, they were not accused of denying so much as one at the beginning; on the contrary, an author has been produced, who, upbraiding them with their changes, excepts the sacraments. Those, Renier speaks of*, might be suspected of varying in this matter, he seeming to say, they rejected not only orders, but also confirmation and extreme unction; but it is manifest, he means such only as Catholics conferred. For, as to confirmation, Renier, who makes them reject it, adds, "They were astonished we permitted none but bishops to confer it:" for this reason, because they were for allowing to good laymen the power of administering this as well as the other sacraments. Wherefore, these same heretics, mentioned as rejecting confirmation, boast, a little after, "of giving the Holy Ghost, by laying on of hands†;" which is, in other words, the very substance of this sacrament.

108.—*Extreme Unction.*

In regard to extreme unction, this is what Renier says of it‡: "They reject the sacrament of unction, as if given to the rich only, and because many priests are necessary thereto;" words, which sufficiently evince that its nullity, which they pretended was amongst us, proceeded from imaginary abuses, not from the nature of the thing. Besides, St. James§ having enjoined to call in the priests in the plural number, these cavillers were for believing that unction, given by a single person, as commonly practised amongst us even so long ago, was not sufficient, and this bad pretext served for their neglecting it.

109.—*What was the Ablution Renier speaks of in Baptism*

As for baptism, notwithstanding these ignorant heretics had cast off its most ancient ceremonies with contempt, there is no doubt but they received it. One might only be surprised at Renier's words||, as uttered by the Vaudois, "that ablution, given to children, is of no advantage to them." But, whereas this ablution is in the list of those ceremonies of baptism, which were disapproved by these heretics, it is plain, he speaks of the wine given to children after their baptism; a custom that may be still seen in many ancient rituals, about that time, and which was a remnant of the communion heretofore administered to them under the liquid species only. This wine, put into the chalice to be given to these children, was called ablution, because this action resembled the ablution taken by the priest at mass. Again, this word ablution is not to be found in Renier as signifying baptism; and, at all events, if men will persist to have it signify this sacrament, all they could conclude from it would be for the worst, viz., that Renier's Vaudois accounted as null whatever baptism was given by unworthy ministers, such as they believed all our priests were; an error so conformable to the principles of the sect, that the Vaudois, whom we have seen approve our baptism, could not do it without running counter to their own doctrine.

---

* C. v. pp. 750, 751. † Ibid. 751. ‡ P. 751. § Ch. v. 14. || P. 751.

110.—*Confession.*

Here, then, already are three sacraments, which the Vaudois approved in the main, Baptism, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction. We have the whole sacrament of penance in their private confession, in the penances imposed by them, in the absolution received for the remission of sins; and if they said, oral confession was not always necessary when contrition was in the heart; they said true, in the main and in certain cases, although frequently, as above instanced, they abused this maxim by too long deferring their confession.

111.—*The Eucharist.*

There was a sect called the Siscidenses, who differed little or nothing from the Vaudois, says Renier, but in that they received the Eucharist. Not that he meant the Vaudois, or poor men of Lyons, did not receive it, he having shewn, on the contrary, that they received even transubstantiation; but he means only, they had an extreme repugnance to receive it from the hands of our priests, whereas these others made less difficulty in it, or perchance, none at all.

112.—*Marriage.—Whether Renier hath calumniated the Vaudois.*

Protestants accuse Renier of calumniating the Vaudois, by reproaching them, "that they condemned marriage;" but these authors mutilate his words*, which here you have entire: "They condemn the sacrament of marriage, by saying, married people sin mortally when they use marriage for any other end than to have children;" whereby Renier would observe only the error of these proud heretics, who, to shew themselves above human infirmity, would not admit the secondary end of marriage, namely, its serving as a remedy against concupiscence? It was then in this respect only that he accused these heretics of condemning marriage, to wit, of condemning this necessary part, and making that a mortal sin, which the grace of so holy a state renders pardonable.

113.—*Demonstration that the Catholics were neither ignorant of, nor dissembled, the doctrine of the Vaudois.*

It is now seen what was the doctrine of the Vaudois or poor men of Lyons. The Catholics cannot be accused, either of not knowing it, since they dwelt and conversed amongst them, and daily received their abjurations; or, of neglecting to inform themselves, since, on the contrary, they applied themselves with so much care to report its minutest points; or, in fine, of calumniating them, since we have seen they were so exact, not only in distinguishing the Vaudois from the Cathari and the rest of the Manicheans, but also in acquainting us with all the temperaments applied by some of them to the extravagances of others; and, in a word, of relating to us with so much sincerity what was commendable in their manners, that their partisans even now-a-days take advantage from it. For we have seen, they did not dissemble the specious appearances at Waldo's first setting out, nor the first simplicity of his followers. Renier†, who so much blames them, hesitates not to say, "that they lived justly before men; that they believed of God what was fitting to believe, and all that was contained in the Creed;" that they were regular in their deportment, modest in their dress, just in their dealings, chaste in their marriages, abstemious in their diet, and so of the rest, as it is well known. We shall have a word to say on this testimony of Renier; but, in the interim, we see he rather flatters, as I may say, than calumniates the Vaudois; and, therefore, it cannot be doubted that what he says besides of these heretics is true. And though we should suppose with the ministers, that Catholic authors, urged on by the hatred they had conceived against them, charged them with calumnies; this is a new proof of what we have but just said concerning their doctrine, because finally, had the Vaudois stood in opposition to transubstantiation and the adoration of the Eucharist, at a time when our adversaries agree it was so well established amongst us, the Catholics, whom they represent so inclined to load them with false crimes, would never have failed reproaching them with what was so true.

---

* c. iv. p. 751.

† Ibid. p. 749. Ibid. vii. p. 765.

114.—*Division of the Vaudois Doctrine into three heads.*

Now then that we know the whole doctrine of the Vaudois, we may divide it into three sorts of articles. Some there are which we detest together with the Protestants: some that we approve, and Protestants reject: others that they approve, and we condemn.

115.—*Doctrine which the Protestants as well as the Catholics reject in the Vaudois.*

The articles we condemn in common are, in the first place, that doctrine so injurious to the Sacraments, which makes their validity depend on the holiness of their ministers; secondly, that of rendering the administration of the Sacraments common to priests and laity without distinction; next, that of forbidding oaths in all cases whatsoever, thereby condemning not only St. Paul the Apostle *, but even God himself who has sworn: lastly, that of condemning the just punishments of malefactors, and authorizing all crimes by impunity.

116.—*Doctrine which the Catholics approve in the Vaudois, and Protestants condemn.*

The articles which we approve, and the Protestants reject, are that of the Seven Sacraments, except, perchance, Orders, and in the manner above spoken to, and what is still more important, that of the Real Presence and Transubstantiation. So many articles which the Protestants detest either with us, or, contrary to our sentiments, in the Vaudois, pass under the cover of five or six points, wherein these same Vaudois favour them; and notwithstanding their hypocrisy and all their errors, these heretics are made to be their ancestors.

117.—*The Vaudois have changed their Doctrine since Luther's and Calvin's time.*

Such was the state of this sect till the time of the new Reformation. For all the noise this made ever since the year 1517, the Vaudois, whom we have seen till that date abiding in all the sentiments of their ancestors, still remained unaltered. At length in 1530, after much suffering, whether solicited to it, or taking it into their heads themselves, they thought fit to make them their protectors, whom like themselves they had heard exclaim against the Pope so many years. Those who had withdrawn for near two hundred years, as Seyssel * remarks, into the mountains of Savoy and Dauphiny, consulted Bucer and the Swiss, their neighbours. With much commendation which they received, Gilles †, one of their historians, acquaints us, they received also admonitions concerning three defects observed amongst them. The first related to the decision of certain points of doctrine; the second, to the establishment of the order of discipline and ecclesiastical assemblies, to the end they might be held more openly; the third invited them, no longer to permit those that desired to be accounted members of their Churches, to be present at Mass, or to adhere, in any kind, to papal superstitions, or to acknowledge the priests of the Roman Church for pastors, or to make use of their ministry.

---

* Heb .vi. pp. 13, 16, 17; and vii. 21.

118.—*New Articles proposed to the Vaudois by the Protestants.*

There needs no more to confirm every thing we have said, concerning the state of these wretched Churches, which concealed their faith and worship under a contrary profession. On these advertisements of Bucer and Œcolampadius, the same Gilles assures us, new articles were proposed to the Vaudois. He owns he does not report them all: but here are five or six of such as he specifies, which sufficiently discover the ancient spirit of the sect. For in order to reform the Vaudois to the Protestant mode, it was necessary to make them say ‡, " that a Christian may swear lawfully; that auricular confession is not commanded of God; that a Christian may lawfully exercise the office of magistrate over other Christians; that there is no determined time for fasting; that the minister may possess something in particular wherewith to maintain his family, without prejudice to apostolic community; that Jesus Christ has appointed but two Sacraments, Baptism and the holy Eucharist." Hereby appears a part of what was necessarily to be reformed in the Vaudois, in order to make them Zuinglians or Calvinists, and, amongst the rest, one of the corrections was, to admit but two Sacraments. It was also necessary to hint to them a word or two concerning predestination, which assuredly they had heard but little of; and they were informed as to this new dogma, which was then like the soul of the Reformation, that whosoever owns free-will, denies predestination. It appears by these same articles that, in process of time, the Vaudois had fallen into new errors, since it was requisite to teach them * "they were to cease from earthly labours on the Sabbath-day, in order to attend God's service;" and again, "that it is not lawful for a Christian to revenge himself on his enemy." These two articles shew the brutality and barbarity, which these Vaudois Churches (the main support, it seems, of decayed Christianity) were fallen into, at the time the Protestants reformed them: and this confirms what Seyssel † says of them, that "they were a base and bestial race of men, that hardly could distinguish, by reason, whether they were men or brutes, alive or dead." Such, by Gilles's account, were the articles of reformation proposed to the Vaudois towards incorporating them with the Protestants. If Gilles mentioned no more of them, it might either proceed from a fear of exposing too great an opposition between the Vaudois and Calvinists, of whom the design then was to make but one communion, or because this was all the Vaudois could be drawn to at that time. Be that as it will, he owns nevertheless ‡, they could not come to an agreement, because some of the barbes were of opinion, that by assenting to all these conclusions, they should dishonour the memory of those who had so very prosperously conducted those churches to that time. Thus, it is manifest, the design of the Protestants was not to follow the Vaudois, but to make them change and reform, to their fashion.

---

* F. 2. † Hist. Eccl. des Egl. Ref. de Pier. Gilles, c. v. ‡ Ibid.

119.—*Conference of the Vaudois with Œcolampadius.*

During this negociation with the ministers of Strasburg and Basil, two of the Vaudois deputies had a long conference with Œcolampadius, which Abraham Scultet, a Protestant historian, relates whole and entire in his Evangelical Annals §, and declares he had transcribed it word for word.

One of the deputies opens the conversation, by owning that the ministers, of which number he was, "being prodigiously ignorant, were incapable of teaching the people: that they lived by alms and labour, poor shepherds or husbandmen, the cause of their profound ignorance and incapacity: that they were not married, nor lived always very chastely; but when they had been caught tripping, they were expelled the company of the rest: that it was not the ministers, but the priests of the Roman Church who administered the Sacraments to the Vaudois; but that their ministers made them ask pardon of God for receiving the Sacraments from those priests, because forced to it; moreover, they admonished them not to adhere to the ceremonies of Antichrist: that they practised auricular confession, and, till then, had always owned seven Sacraments, wherein, they heard it said, they were very much mistaken." They proceed to give an account how they rejected the mass, purgatory, and the invocation of saints, and in order to clear up their doubts, they propose the following queries:—" Whether or no it be lawful for magistrates to put criminals to death, by reason God has said, I will not the death of the sinner?" But asked at the same time, " If it were not allowable in them to kill the false brethren who informed against them to Catholics, because, they having no jurisdiction amongst them, there was no other way to keep them in awe: whether the human and civil laws, by which the world was governed, were good, the Scripture having said, that the laws of men are vain: whether churchmen might receive donations and have anything of their own: whether it were lawful to swear: whether the distinction they made of original, venial, and mortal sin, were good: whether all children, of whatsoever nation, be saved by the merits of Jesus Christ; and whether the adult, of whatsoever religion, not having faith, may also be saved; what be the judiciary and ceremonial precepts of the law of Moses: and whether they have been abolished by Jesus Christ; and which be the canonical books." After all these queries, which so clearly confirm all we have said of the Vaudois' belief, and the brutal ignorance these heretics were at last fallen into, their deputy speaks in these terms:—" Nothing has so much disturbed us, weak and simple as we are, as what I have read in Luther concerning free-will and predestination; for we believe all men have naturally some power and strength, which, excited by God, might do something, conformably to those words, Behold, I stand at the door and knock; and whosoever would not open, should receive according to his works: but if the thing be not so, I do not see, as says Erasmus, of what use the commandments are. As for predestination, we believe that God has foreseen from all eternity those that were to be saved or damned, and that he had made all men in order to be saved, and the reprobate become such through their own fault: but should all come to pass of necessity, as Luther says, and the predestinated not have it in their power to turn reprobate, nor contrarywise, to what end so much preaching and so much writing, since, every thing happening by necessity, matters never will be better or worse?" Whatever ignorance may appear throughout this discourse, it is plain, these ignorant people, with all their rusticity, spoke better than those they had chosen for reformers; and here are the men, forsooth, they present us as the remains and refuge of Christianity.

---

* Gilles, c. v. † F. 38. ‡ Gill. Ibid. c. v.

§ Ann. Eccl. decad. 2. An. 1530. a p. 294, ad 300. Heidelb.

We find nothing here particular relating to the Eucharist; which makes it likely, that the whole of the conference was not related; nor is it difficult to guess the reason. It was, in short, because the Vaudois were, as above seen, greater Papists on this head than the Zuinglians and Lutherans desired. Moreover, this deputy speaks nothing to Œcolampadius of any Confession of Faith as in use amongst them; and we have already seen that even Beza[*] reports none but that which the Vaudois made in 1541, so long after Luther and Calvin: which shews manifestly, that the Confessions of Faith produced by them, as of the ancient Vaudois, can be but very modern, as we shall soon discover.

120.—*The Vaudois nowise Calvinists, as proved from Crespin.*

After all these conferences with those of Strasburg and Basil in 1536, Geneva was consulted by her neighbours the Vaudois, and then it was that their society with the Calvinists commenced, by the instructions of Farel, minister of Geneva. But we need only hear the Calvinists themselves, to be convinced how far remote the Vaudois were from their Reformation. Crespin[†], in his History of Martyrs, says, that those of Angrogne, by a long succession, and as from father to son, had retained some purity of doctrine. But to shew how small, even in their estimate, was this purity of doctrine, he says in another place[‡], speaking of the Vaudois of Merindol, "that the *very little true light they had*, they endeavoured to increase from day to day, by dispatching people on all sides, even to a great distance off, wheresoever they heard some ray of light did discover itself." And he agrees moreover in another place[§], that "their ministers, who taught them in private, did not do it with that purity, which was requisite; inasmuch as ignorance having overflowed the whole universe, and God having a right to let men go astray as he did, like brute beasts, it is no wonder these poor men had not so pure a doctrine as they have since enjoyed, and at this day more than ever." These last words shew the pains the Calvinists were at since the year 1536, to lead the Vaudois whither they had a mind; and after all, it is but too manifest that, from that time, this sect is not to be looked on as persisting in her ancient doctrine, but as reformed by the Calvinists.

---

[*] Sleid. l. ii, n. 4.
[†] Hist. des Mart. in 1536. f. 111.
[‡] In 1543. f. 133.
[§] In 1561. f. 532.

121.—*Proof from Beza.*

We learn as much from Beza*, though with a little more precaution, when he owns in his description of them, "that the purity of doctrine was somewhat adulterated by the Vaudois;" and in his history, that "in process of time, they had somewhat swerved from piety and doctrine." Afterwards he speaks more openly†, confessing that "in a long series of time the purity of doctrine had been greatly adulterated by their Ministers, insomuch that they became sensible, by the ministry of Œcolampadius, of Bucer, and others, how, by little and little, the purity of doctrine had not remained amongst them, and gave orders, by sending to their brethren in Calabria, to put all things in a better state."

122.—*The change of the Calabrian Vaudois, and their entire extinction.*

These brethren of Calabria were, like them, fugitives, who, according to the maxims of the sect, held their assemblies, as Gilles reports‡, "in the most secret manner it was possible, *and dissembled many things* against their will." What this minister endeavours to hide under these words, you must understand was, that the Vaudois of Calabria, after the example of all the rest of them, performed all the external duties of good Catholics; and I leave you to judge whether they could have been exempt from it in that country, considering what we have seen of their dissimulation in the valleys of Pragelas and Angrogne. Accordingly Gilles acquaints us, how that these Calabrians, pressed at last to withdraw from church assemblies, yet not able to take the resolution, though advised to it by this minister, "of forsaking so fine a country," were soon abolished.

---

* Liv. i. p. 23. 1536. † Ibid. pp. 35, 36. 1544.

‡ Gilles, ch. iii. et xxix.

123.—*The present Vaudois are not the predecessors, but followers of the Calvinists.*

Thus expired the Vaudois. As they had only subsisted by concealing what they were, they fell as soon as ever they resolved to declare themselves; for those that afterwards remained under that name, it is plain, were nothing else but Calvinists, whom Farel and the other ministers of Geneva had formed to their mode; so that these Vaudois, whom they make their ancestors and predecessors, to speak the truth, are nothing but their successors, and new disciples whom they have proselyted to their faith.

124.—*No advantage to be derived from the Vaudois in behalf of the Calvinists.*

But, after all, what help can these Vaudois, by whom they seek to justify themselves, afford our Calvinists? It is manifest by this history that Waldo and his disciples were all mere laymen, who thrust themselves in to preach, without orders, without mission, and afterwards to administer the sacraments. They separated from the church by a manifest error, detested as much by Protestants as Catholics, which was that of Donatism; nay, this Donatism of the Vaudois is beyond comparison much worse than the African Donatism of old, so strongly confuted by St. Austin. Those Donatists of Africa said, indeed, that none but a holy person could validly administer the sacraments; but they did not arrive at the extravagance of the Vaudois, to allow the administration of the sacraments as well to holy laymen as holy priests. If the African Donatists pretended that the Catholic bishops and priests had forfeited their ministry by their crimes, they at least accused them of crimes, which were actually reproved by the law of God. But our new Donatists separate themselves from the whole Catholic clergy, and would have it, they were degraded from their orders for not observing their pretended apostolic poverty, which, at most, was but a counsel. For this was the origin of the sect, and what we have seen it stood to, as long as it persisted in its first belief. Who, therefore, does not see that such a sect is nothing at bottom, but hypocrisy boasting her poverty and other virtues, and making the sacraments depend, not on the efficacy Jesus Christ has given them, but on man's merits? And, after all, these new doctors, from whom the Calvinists derive their succession, Whence came they themselves, and who sent them? Puzzled at this query no less than the Protestants, like them they went in quest of predecessors, and here is the fable trumped up by them. They were told, that in the time of St. Sylvester*, when Constantine endowed the churches with revenues, "One of this pope's companions would not consent to it, and withdrew from his communion, abiding, together with them that followed him, in the way of poverty; and then it was the church failed in Sylvester and his adherents, and remained with them." Let not this be called a calumny invented by the enemies of the Vaudois, for we have seen, that the authors, who unanimously report it, had no design of calumniating them. This fable was still in vogue in Seyssel's time†. The vulgar were then told, "This sect had taken its rise from a certain man called Leo, a very religious person, in the time of Constantine the Great, who detesting the avarice of Sylvester, and Constantine's excessive liberality, chose rather to follow the poverty and simplicity of faith, than, with Sylvester, to defile himself with a fat and rich benefice, to which Leo and all those joined themselves, that judged aright in faith." These ignorant people had been made to believe, it was from this counterfeit Leo, the sect of Leonists derived their name and birth. Christians are all for finding a succession in their church and doctrine. Protestants boast of theirs in the Vaudois, the Vaudois in their pretended companion of St. Sylvester; and both are equally fictitious.

125.—*The Calvinists have no contemporary authors to favour their pretensions to the Vaudois.*

All the truth to be found in the origin of the Vaudois is, that they took their motive of separation from the endowing of churches and church-men, contrary, as they pretended, to that poverty Jesus Christ requires of his ministers. But as this origin is absurd, and besides, nowise serves the turn of Protestants, we have seen what an account Paul Perrin has given of it in his history of the Vaudois‡. He represents this Waldo as a person "the most courageous in opposing the Real" Presence in the year 1160. But does he produce any author in confirmation of what he says? No, not so much as one; neither Aubertin, nor La Roque, nor Chappel,—in a word, no Protestant of Germany or France hath produced, or ever will produce, any one author, either of those times, or of succeeding ages, for the space of three or four hundred years, who gives the Vaudois that origin which this historian lays for the foundation of his history. Have any of the Catholics, who wrote so copiously, whatever Berengarius and the rest objected against the Real Presence, so much as named Waldo amongst those that opposed it? None ever has dreamed of it; we have seen what they said of Waldo was far different. But why must they have spared him only? What, then, did this man, whom they make so courageous in stemming the torrent, so conceal his doctrine that none ever could perceive he impugned an article of this importance? Or, was Waldo so formidable a person, that no Catholic durst impeach him of this error at the time they impeached him of so many others? An historian that sets out with a fact of this nature, and lays it for the foundation of his history, what credit does he deserve? Nevertheless, Paul Perrin is heard, like an oracle, among Calvinists, so readily do they come into whatever favours the prejudices of the sect.

---

* Ren. c. iv. v. p. 749. Pylicd. c. iv. p. 779. Frag. Pylicd. pp. 815, 816, &c.

† Seyss. f. 5.

‡ Hist. des Vaudois, ch. i.

126.—*Vaudois books produced by Perrin.*

But, for want of known authors, Perrin produces*, for his only proof, some old books of the Vaudois, in manuscript, which he pretends to have recovered; amongst the rest, one volume, wherein was "A book, concerning Antichrist, bearing date 1120, and in this same volume, many sermons of the Vaudois Barbes." But it is already evidently made out, that there neither were Vaudois nor Barbes in 1120; since Waldo, by Perrin's own account, did not appear till 1160. The word barbe was not known, nor in use among the Vaudois to signify their doctors, till many ages after, and manifestly in the latter times. So, these discourses cannot all of them be made to pass as of eleven hundred and twenty years standing. Nay, Perrin himself is reduced to allow this date only to the discourse concerning Antichrist, which, by this means, he hopes to father on Peter de Bruis, who lived about that time, or on some of his disciples. But the date standing in the front, should seemingly extend to all, and consequently is utterly false in regard of the first, as it evidently is in regard of the rest. And besides, this treatise about Antichrist, which he pretends to be of 1160, is not in a different language from the other pieces of the Barbes cited by Perrin; and this language is very modern, very little unlike the Provence dialect, now in use. Not only Villehardouin's language, who wrote a hundred years since

---

* Hist. des Vaudois, lib. i. ch. vii. p. 57. Hist. des Vaud. et Albig. part iii. lib. iii. ch. i. p. 253.

Peter de Bruis, but that also of the authors subsequent to Villehardouin, is more obsolete and obscure than that which he would make to pass for eleven hundred and twenty years old; so that there is not a more gross and palpable imposition, than to palm on us these pieces as of remote antiquity.

127.—*Sequel.*

Nevertheless, on account of this sole date of 1120, placed, you know not by whom, you know not when, in this Vaudois volume no body knows any thing of, our Calvinists have cited this book about Antichrist as undoubtedly the work of "some one of Peter de Bruis's" disciples, or as his own*. The same authors quote, with great confidence, some discourses which Perrin † has annexed to that concerning Antichrist, as if of the same date 1120, although, in one of those where purgatory is handled, is cited a book which St. Austin entitled, as the original has it, "Milparlemens," that is, of a thousand sayings, as if St. Austin had written a book with this title; which can be attributed to nothing but a compilation made in the thirteenth century, bearing this title, "Milleloquium Sancti Augustini," which the ignorant author of this treatise on Purgatory took for the work of this father. Besides this, we might be able to say something of the age of these Vaudois books, and the alterations possibly made in them, were we told of some known library where they might be seen. Till the public has received this necessary information, we cannot but wonder such books have been produced to us for authentic as have not been seen but by Perrin alone; neither Aubertin nor La Roque citing them otherwise than on his word, without so much as telling us they have ever handled them. This Perrin ‡, who alone boasts of them to us, observes none of those marks in them whereby the date of a book may be ascertained, or its antiquity proved; and all he tells us is, they are old Vaudois volumes; which, in general, may be said of the most modern Gothic books of no more than a hundred or sixscore years' antiquity. There is then every reason for believing that these books, whence they produce what they please without any solid proof of their date, have been composed or altered by those Vaudois, whom Farel and his brethren reformed in their way.

---

* Aub. p. 962. La Roque. Hist. de l'Euchar. pp. 451, 459.

† Hist. des Vaud. part iii. liv. iii. ch. ii. p. 305.

‡ Ibid. liv. i. ch. vii. p. 56.

128.—*Confession of Faith produced by Perrin—That it is posterior to Calvinism.*

As to the Confession of Faith published by Perrin*, and which all Protestants quote as an authentic piece of the ancient Vaudois, "It is extracted," says he, "from a book entitled the 'Spiritual Almanac,' and from the 'Memoirs of George Morel.'" As for the Spiritual Almanac, I know not what to say to it, unless, that neither Perrin, nor even Leger, who speaks with so great a regard for the books of the Vaudois, have mentioned any thing of the date of this. They have not even thought it worth their while to acquaint us whether it may be a manuscript or in print; and we may hold it for certain, it is very modern, since those who would make the most of it, have not specified its antiquity. But what Perrin reports is decisive, viz., that this Confession of Faith is extracted from the Memoirs of George Morel. Now it is plain from Perrin himself†, that George Morel was the man who about the year 1530, (so many years after the Reformation) went to confer with Œcolampadius and Bucer, concerning the means to bring about an union: which makes it clear enough that this Confession of Faith is not, any more than the rest, produced by Perrin, of the ancient Vaudois, but of the Vaudois reformed according to the model of the Protestants.

129.—*Demonstration that the Vaudois had no Confession of Faith before the pretended Reformation.*

Accordingly it has been already remarked by us, that no mention of a Vaudois confession of faith was made in the Conference of 1530, betwixt Œcolampadius and the said Vaudois. We may even boldly assert, they never made a confession of faith till a long while after, since that Beza, so diligent in his researches into, and taking advantage from, the acts of these heretics, says nothing, as has been seen, of any such confession of faith, that he knew of, except in 1541. However that may be, never before Luther's and Calvin's Reformation had a Vaudois confession of faith been so much as heard of‡. Seyssel, whom pastoral vigilancy and the duty of his charge engaged in those latter times, namely, in 1516 and 1517, to so exact an inquiry into all that concerned this sect, says not one word of a confession of faith: and the reason was§, because he had never

* Hist. des Vaud. liv. i. ch. 12, p. 76. Ibid.

† Lett. of Œcolamp. Perr. Ibid. ch. vi. p. 46; vii. p. 59.

‡ S. n. 4.

§ Seyss. f. 3. et seq.

heard of any such thing, either from juridical examinations, or from those of his own converts, who, with so great tokens of sincerity, discovered to him, with tears and compunction, the whole secret of the sect. They had not, therefore, at that time, any such confession; their doctrine was to be learnt, as we have seen, by their interrogatories at tribunals; but as for a confession of faith, or any Vaudois writing, we find not a word in those authors that knew them best. On the contrary, the brethren of Bohemia, a sect of whom we shall speak presently, and which the Vaudois have frequently strove to unite themselves to, both before and since Luther's time, assure us they wrote nothing. "They never had," say they*, "a church known in Bohemia, nor had our people learnt anything of their doctrine, by reason they never had published any writings we know of." And in another place—"They would not suffer that there should be any public testimony of their doctrine." But if you will say, they had nevertheless, amongst themselves, some writing and some confessions of faith; if so, doubtless they would have communicated them to the brethren with whom they wished to unite themselves. But the brethren declare, they knew nothing as to that point, except from some articles of Merindol, "which articles," say they, "possibly might have been polished since our time." This is what a learned minister of the Bohemians writes †, a long while after the Reformation of Luther and Calvin. He would have spoken more accurately if, instead of saying these articles were "polished," he had said they were coined since the Reformation. But so it was that men were willing, in the party, to give some air of antiquity to the Vaudois articles, nor would this minister entirely disclose the secret of the sect. Be that as it will, he says enough of it to convince us what we ought to credit concerning the confessions of faith produced, in his time, under the name of the Vaudois; and it is easily perceived they knew nothing of the Protestant doctrine before they had been taught it by the Protestants. Nay, they scarce knew what they themselves believed, and but confusedly delivered their minds concerning it to their best friends, so far from having confessions of faith already at hand, as Perrin would fain persuade us.

---

* Esrom. Rudig. de frat. Orth. narrat. Heid. cum Hist. Cam. 1605, pp. 147, 148. Præf. Conf. fid. frat. Bohem. An. 1572. Ibid. 173.

† Rud. Ibid. pp. 147, 148.

130.—*The Vaudois, in drawing their Calvinistical Confession of Faith, retained something of the Dogmata that were peculiar to them.*

And nevertheless we perceive, even in these pieces of Perrin, some footsteps of the ancient genius of the Vaudois, a confirmation of what we have already said concerning them. For example, in the book about Antichrist, it is said*, "That the emperors and kings supposing that Antichrist resembled the true and holy mother the Church, they loved him, and endowed him contrary to God's command," which comes up to the tenet of the Vaudois, that the clergy are forbidden to have any goods; an error, as above seen, which was the first groundwork of their separation. What is advanced in the catechism, viz., that you may know the ministers "by their true sense of the faith, and by their holy doctrine and life of good example," &c., suits also with that error, which made the Vaudois believe, that ministers of an evil life were degraded from their ministry, and lost the administration of the sacraments. For which reason, in the book that treats of Antichrist, it is also said, that one of his works is, "to attribute the Reformation of the Holy Ghost to faith exteriorly dead, and to baptize children into this faith, teaching that, by this faith, these children do receive from him baptism and regeneration:" words whereby a living faith is required in the ministers of baptism, as a thing necessary for the child's regeneration, and the contrary is ranked among the works of Antichrist. Thus, when they composed these new confessions of faith agreeable to the Reformation, which they had a design of entering into, there was no hindering them from still insinuating something that savoured of the old leaven; and without further loss of time in this inquiry, it is sufficient you have observed, in these works of the Vaudois, the two errors which were the ground of their separation.

131.—*Reflections on the History of the Albigenses and Vaudois—Artifice of the Ministers.*

Such is the history of the Albigenses and Vaudois as reported by the authors of those times. Our Reformed, finding nothing therein favourable to their pretensions, connived at their being imposed upon by the most gross of all artifices. Many Catholic authors who wrote in this, or towards the end of the preceding age, have not sufficiently distinguished the Vaudois from the Albigenses, but given the general name of Vaudois alike to both of them. Whatever might have been the cause of their error, our Protestants are more able critics than to require we should credit either Mariana, or Gretser, or even Thuanus, and some other moderns, to the prejudice of the ancient authors, who all unanimously, as we have seen, distinguished these two sects. Nevertheless, on so gross an error, the Protestants, after taking it for granted that the Albigenses and Vaudois were but one and the same sect, have concluded, that nought but calumny branded the Albigenses with the imputation of Manicheism, since the Vaudois, according to the ancient authors, are exempt from that blemish.

---

* Hist. des Vaud. et Albig. part iii. l. iii. ch. i. p. 292. Ibid. part iii. l. i., p. 157. Ibid. l. iii. p. 267.

132.—*Demonstration that the Heretics, who denied the Reality in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were Manicheans.—Notoriously false supposition of the Ministers.*

They ought to reflect that these ancients, who, in accusing the Vaudois of other errors, have acquitted them of Manicheism, at the same time have distinguished them from the Albigenses whom we have convicted of it. For example, the minister de la Roque, who, as he was the last who wrote on this subject, has mustered up the subtle quirks of all the other authors of the party, and especially those of Aubertin, believes he has justified the Albigenses as to their rejecting the Old Testament, like the Manicheans, by shewing from Renier's testimony, that the Vaudois received it*: he gains nothing, since these Vaudois are, in the same Renier †, thoroughly distinguished from the Cathari, the stem of the Albigensian progeny. The same La Roque ‡ thinks to reap advantage from certain heretics, who, according to Radulphus Ardens, said, "That the sacrament was nothing but mere bread." It is true; but the same Radulphus adds, what La Roque no less than Aubertin have dissembled, that these same heretics "admit two Creators, and reject the Old Testament, the truth of the incarnation, marriage, and the use of flesh-meat." The same minister also cites certain heretics mentioned by Peter de Vaucernay §, who denied the truth of Jesus Christ's body in the Eucharist. I own it; but, at the same time, this historian || assures us, they

---

* La Roq. 459, Aub. p. 967, ex. Ren. c. iii. p. 5.

† Ren. c. vi.

‡ La Roq. 456. Aub. p. 964. B. Rad. Ard. Serm. 8. Post Pentec.

§ La Roq. Aub. Ibid. 965. ex. Pet. de Valle-Cern. Hist. Albig. lib. ii. cap. 6.

|| Hist. Albig. cap. 2.

admitted the two principles, with all the train of Manichean errors. La Roque would make us believe, that the same Peter de Vaucernay distinguishes the Arians and Manicheans from the Vaudois and Albigenses. The half of his statement is true: it is true that he distinguishes the Manicheans from the Vaudois, but he distinguishes them not from the heretics "that were in the country of Narbonne;" and certain it is, these are the same that were called Albigenses, and who unquestionably were Manicheans. But, continues the same La Roque*, Renier owns heretics who say, "the body of Jesus Christ is mere bread;" they were those he calls Ordibarians that spoke thus, and, at the same time, denied the Creation, and vented a thousand other blasphemies which Manicheism had introduced: so that these enemies of the Real Presence were at the same time no less enemies of the Creator than the Deity.

133.—*Sequel.—Manicheism at Metz.—The Bogomilists.*

La Roque returns to the attack with Aubertin, and believes he finds good Protestants in the persons of those heretics, who, by the testimony of Cesarius of Hesterback †, "blasphemed the body and blood of Jesus Christ." But the same Cesarius informs us, they admitted the two principles, and all the other Manichean blasphemies; which he avers he is very well assured of, not from hearsay, but "from his frequent conversation with them in the Diocese of Metz." A famous minister of Metz, whom I was well acquainted with, made the Calvinists of that country believe these Albigenses of Cesarius were their ancestors; and then they were plainly shewn, that these ancestors he had given them, were abominable Manicheans. La Roque, in his history of the Eucharist, would fain have us believe, the Bogomilists were the same with those called, in divers places, Vaudois, poor men of Lyons, Bulgarians, Insabbatized, Gazares, Poplicans, and Turlupins. I agree that the Vaudois, the Insabbatized, and the poor men of Lyons are the same sect; but that they were called Gazares or Cathari, Poplicans, Bulgarians, or Bogomilists, is what never will be proved from any author of those times. Nevertheless, M. de la Roque must needs have these Bogomilists to be their friends; surely for this reason, because "they accounted the body and blood, which we consecrate, unworthy of all esteem." But he ought to have learned from Anna Comnena‡, who has given us a right notion of these heretics, "that they reduced to a phantom the incarnation of Jesus; that they taught such impurities as the modesty of her sex forbad this princess to repeat; and, in a word, that they had been convicted by the Emperor Alexius, her father, of introducing a dogma mixed with two the most infamous of all heresies, that of the Manicheans and that of the Massalians."

---

* La Roque, p. 457. Aub. p. 965. Ren. cap. vi.

† Cæsar. Hesterb. lib. v. cap. 2, in Bibl. Cisterc. La Roque, p. 457. Aub. p. 964. Ferri Cat. Gen. pp. 85, 455.

‡ An. Comn. Alex. lib. xv. p. 486, *et seq.*

134.—*Sequel of the suppositions of the Ministers.*

The same La Roque* numbers also amongst his friends Peter Moran, who, pressed to declare his faith before all the people, confessed, "He did not believe the consecrated bread was the body of our Lord;" and he forgets that this Peter Moran, by the report of the author whose testimony he cites, was of the number of those heretics convicted of Manicheism, who were called Arians for the reason abovementioned.

135.—*Another falsity.*

This author reckons also amongst his friends † those heretics, concerning whom it is said in the Council of Toulouse, under Calixtus II., "that they rejected the sacrament of Jesus Christ's body and blood;" and he mutilates the very canon he has taken these words from, in the sequel whereof is to be seen, that these heretics, together with the sacrament of the body and blood, "rejected also infant baptism and lawful wedlock."

136.—*Another passage mutilated.*

With the like boldness he corrupts ‡ a passage of Emerick, the inquisitor, concerning the Vaudois. "Emerick, (says he,) attributes to them, as a heresy, their saying that the bread is not transubstantiated into the true body of Jesus Christ, nor the wine into blood." Who would not believe the Vaudois convicted by this testimony of denying transubstantiation? but we have given the whole passage, where you will read, "The ninth error of the Vaudois is, that the bread is not transubstantiated into the body of Jesus Christ, *if the priest who consecrate it be a sinner.*" M. la Roque cuts off these last words, and, by this falsification alone, takes from the Vaudois two important points of their doctrine: one, which is the abhorrence of all Protestants, to wit, transubstantiation; the other, which is the abhorrence of all Christians, namely, their saying, that the sacraments lose their virtue in the hands of unworthy ministers. Thus do our adversaries prove what they please by manifest falsifications, nor dread giving themselves predecessors even at this rate.

---

* La Roq. p. 458. Rog. de Hoved. An. Angl. Baron. ad 1178.
† La Roq. p. 451. Conc. Tolos. An. 1119. Can. iii. v. 8.
‡ P. 457. Direct. part ii. p. 14.

137.—*Recapitulation.*

These are a part of Aubertin's and La Roque's illusions with regard to the Albigenses, and Vaudois, or poor men of Lyons. In a word, they perfectly vindicate these last from Manicheism, but, at the same time, bring no kind of proof to shew they denied transubstantiation; on the contrary, they corrupt the passages which prove that they admitted it. And as for those who denied it in those days, they produce none but such as are convicted of Manicheism, by the testimony of the same authors that accuse them of denying the change of substance in the Eucharist; so that their ancestors either, with us, defend transubstantiation as the Vaudois, or are convicted of Manicheism with the Albigenses.

138.—*Two other objections of the Ministers.*

But here is what these ministers have advanced with greater subtilty. Overpowered by the number of authors, who, treating of these Toulousian and Albigensian heretics, make them perfect Manicheans, they cannot deny there were such, and even in those countries; and they were those, say they *, who were called Cathari or Puritans. But, they add, they were very few in number, since Renier †, who knew them so well, assures us, they had but "sixteen churches in the whole world;" nay, that the number of these Cathari did not exceed four thousand in all parts of the earth; "whereas," says Renier ‡, "the believers are not to be numbered." These ministers would have it understood from this passage, that these sixteen churches, and four thousand men spread in all parts of the universe, could not have caused in it all that noise and all those wars the Albigenses were authors of; it must, therefore, have happened that the name of Cathari or Manicheans was extended to some other sect more numerous, and that the Vaudois and Albigenses had the name of Manicheans given them either by mistake or calumny.

---

* Aub. p. 968. a. La Roq. p. 460, ex. † C. vi. ‡ Ibid.

139.—*Sixteen Churches of the Manicheans that comprehend the whole Sect.*

Whoever wishes to see what length prejudice or illusion will go, needs but to hear, after what the ministers have said, the truth I am going to relate, or rather, call to mind what has already been related. And, in the first place, as to these sixteen churches, you have seen that the word Church was taken in this place by Renier *, not for particular churches which were in certain towns, but often, for whole provinces: thus you find amongst these churches, the church of Sclavonia, the church of Marc-Ancona in Italy, the church of France, the church of Bulgaria, the mother of all the rest. All Lombardy was contained under the title of two churches: those of Toulouse and Alby, which in France formerly were the most numerous, comprehended all Languedoc, and so forth; so that, under the denomination of sixteen churches, the whole sect was expressed as divided into sixteen cantons, all which had their relation to Bulgaria, as above seen.

140.—*The Cathari, in number four thousand.—How is this to be understood.*

We have also observed, with respect to those four thousand Cathari, that none were understood by that name but the perfect of the sect, called elect in St. Austin's time; but at the same time that Renier assures us, in his time, to wit, in the middle of the thirteenth century, when the sect was weakened, though there were but four thousand perfect Cathari, yet, that the multitude of the rest of the sect, namely, of simple believers, was then infinite.

141.—*Whether the word Believers, in the ancient authors, signified the Vaudois.—Aubertin's fallacy.*

La Roque, after Aubertin †, pretends, the word "Believers" signified the Vaudois, by reason that Pylicdorf, and Renier himself, call them so. But here is again too palpable a fallacy. The word "Believers" was common to all the sects: each sect had its believers or followers. The Vaudois had their believers, *Credentes ipsorum*, whom Pylicdorf has spoken of in divers places. Not that the word "Believers" was appropriated to the Vaudois; but the thing meant was, that they had theirs like the rest. The passages cited from Renier, by the ministers, says, the heretics "had their believers, *Credentes suos*, to whom they allowed all kind of crimes." It is not the Vaudois he speaks of, since he commends their good deportment. The same Renier relates the mysteries of the Cathari, or the breaking of their bread, and says *, "they admitted to this table not only the Cathari, *men and women*, but also their believers," namely, those who were not as yet arrived to the perfection of the Cathari: which shews manifestly these two orders so well known among the Manicheans; and what he further remarks, that the simple believers were admitted to this kind of mystery, makes it evident, that there were other mysteries which they were not deemed worthy of. These believers of the Cathari were therefore the "innumerable" abovementioned; and these, guided by the rest of an inferior number, raised all the commotions which disturbed the world.

---

* Ren. c. vi.

† Aub. 968. a. La Roq. 460. c. i. 14, 18. p. 780, &c. c. i. p. 747.

142.—*Conclusion: that the Vaudois concur not in sentiment with the Calvinists.*

Here have you then the subtilties, not to say artifices, the ministers are reduced to, in order to find themselves predecessors. They have none of an apparent and continued succession: of such they go in search the best way they are able, amongst obscure sects whom they strive to unite, and make of them good Calvinists, though there be nothing they all agree in, but their hatred against the Pope and Church.

143.—*What is to be believed concerning the lives of the Vaudois.*

It will be asked me, perhaps, what is my opinion concerning the manners of the Vaudois so much extolled by Renier? I can easily credit all he says, nay, if they please, more than Renier said of them; for the Devil matters not by what sort of bands he secures men to him. Those Toulousian heretics, confessedly Manicheans, had not less of this apparent piety than the Vaudois. It was of them St. Bernard said †: "Their manners are irreproachable; they oppress none; they injure no man; their countenances are mortified and wan with fasting; they eat not their bread like sluggards, but labour to gain a livelihood." What can be more plausible than these heretics mentioned by St. Bernard? But after all, they were Manicheans, and their piety but disguise. Inspect the foundation: it was pride, it was hatred against the clergy, it was rancour against the church; this made them drink in the whole poison of an abominable heresy. An ignorant people may be led whither you please, when, after kindling a violent passion in their breasts, especially hatred against their guides, you use it as a chain to drag them by. But what shall we say of the Vaudois, who kept themselves so clear of the Manichean errors? The Devil had accomplished his work in them, when he inspired them with the same pride; the same ostentation of their pretended Apostolic poverty; the same presumption to boast their virtues; the same hatred against the clergy, carried so far as even to despise the Sacraments in their hands; the same bitterness against their brethren, even to a rupture from them and open schism. With this hatred in their breasts, even though they were externally still more just than has been reported, St. John assures me[*], they are murderers. Were they as chaste as angels, their lot would be no better than that of the "foolish virgins[†]," whose lamps were void of oil, and hearts void of that sweetness which alone can nourish charity.

---

* C. vi. p. 756.

† Serm. 65, in Cant.

144.—*Sourness is the character of this Sect.—Abuse of the Scripture.*

Renier[‡] has therefore justly pointed out the character of these heretics, when he resolves the cause of their error into hatred, bitterness, and rancour: *Sic processit doctrina ipsorum, et rancor.* These heretics, says he, whose exterior was so specious, read much, "and prayed little. They went to sermons, but in order to lay snares for the preacher, as the Jews did for the Son of God;" as much as to say, there was amongst them much of the spirit of contention, but little of the spirit of compunction. All of them in general, Manicheans and Vaudois, never ceased inveighing against human inventions, and citing the holy Scripture, whence they always had a text at hand upon all occasions[§]. When examined concerning faith, they eluded the question by equivocating; if reproved for this, it was Jesus Christ himself, said they, that taught them this practice when he said to the Jews: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up[||];" meaning of the temple of his body what the Jews understood of that of Solomon. This text, to those that knew no better, seemed expressly made for their purpose. The Vaudois had a hundred others of this sort, which they were expert in wresting to their own purposes; and to those not thoroughly versed in Scripture, it was no easy matter to escape their snares. Another author* remarks a very singular character in these false professors of poverty. They did not proceed like a St. Bernard, like a St. Francis, like other apostolic preachers, and attack in the midst of the world the dissolute livers, the usurers, the gamesters, the blasphemers, and the like public sinners in order to convert them: on the contrary, whomsoever they found, in towns or villages that were peaceable and retired, it was into their houses they insinuated themselves under the covert of their exterior simplicity. Scarce durst they raise their voice, their meekness was so great: yet the topic of wicked priests and wicked monks was introduced forthwith: a keen and merciless satire put on the disguise of zeal; well-meaning people, that listened to them, were ensnared; and transported with this bitter zeal, imagined even they became better men by becoming heretics: thus an universal contagion diffused itself. Some were drawn into vice by the great scandals that appeared in the world on every side: the devil took in the simple after another manner; and, by a false horror of the wicked, alienated them from the Church, wherein the number of such was daily seen to increase.

---

[*] 1 John iii. 15.
[†] Matt. xxv. 3.
[‡] Ch. v. p. 749
[§] Ren. Ibid.
[||] John ii. 19.

145.—*Eminent sanctity in the Catholic Church.*

Nothing could be more unjust; since the Church, far from approving the disorders which gave a handle to the revolt of heretics, by all her decrees detested them, and nourished at the same time in her bosom men of so eminent a holiness, that in comparison to it, all the virtue of these hypocrites appeared as nothing. St. Bernard alone, whom God raised in those days with all the graces of the Prophets and Apostles to combat these new heretics, when they were making their greatest efforts to spread themselves in France, was alone sufficient to confound them. In him might they behold a spirit truly apostolical, a sanctity of such a lustre, that even those whose errors he impugned were in admiration of it, insomuch that there were some of them who, whilst they wickedly anathematized the holy doctors, excepted St. Bernard from that sentence †, and thought themselves obliged to publish, that at last he had come over to their party: so much did they blush to have against them so great a witness. Amongst his other virtues, was seen to shine in him, and his brethren the holy Monks of

---

* Pylicd. c. x. p. 283.

† Apud. Ren. ch. vi. p. 755.

Cisteaux and Clairvaux, to mention nothing of the rest, that apostolic poverty these heretics boasted so much of; but St. Bernard and his disciples, notwithstanding they carried this poverty and Christian mortification to its utmost height, did not glory that they alone had preserved the Sacraments, nor were they the less obedient to superiors however wicked, distinguishing, with Jesus Christ, abuses from the chair and doctrine.

146.—*Bitterness and presumption of Heretics.*

At the same time, great saints might be numbered, not only among the bishops, among the priests, among the monks, but also among the common people, and even amongst princes, in the midst of this worldly pomp; but heretics cared to look on nothing but vice, that they might say more boldly with the pharisee, "We are not as other men are[*];" we are spotless, we are the poor beloved of God; come to us if you will receive the Sacraments.

147.—*Whether their false constancy ought to surprise us.—St. Bernard's memorable answer.*

One ought not, therefore, to be surprised at the apparent regularity of their manners, this being a part of that seduction against which we have been put on our guard by so many admonitions of the gospel. To finish the external piety of these heretics, this last stroke is added; that they suffered with a surprising patience. It is true, and this it is which completes the illusion. For the heretics of those times, and even the Manicheans, whose infamies we have beheld, after shifting and dissembling as long as ever they were able to escape punishment, when convicted, and condemned by the laws, ran to death with joy. Their false constancy amazed the world: Enervin, their accuser[†], was nevertheless astonished, and inquired of St. Bernard with concern the meaning of such a prodigy. But the saint, too well versed in the deep wiles of Satan to be ignorant of his being able to make those he held captives mimic even martyrdom itself, answered, that by a just judgment of God, the evil one might have power, "Not only over the bodies of men, but also over their hearts[‡];" and if he was able to prevail with Judas to destroy himself, he might well work on these heretics to suffer death from the hands of others. Let us not, therefore, wonder, if we see martyrs of all religions, even of those the most monstrous, but let us learn from this example, to hold none for true martyrs but those who die in unity.

---

[*] Luke xviii. 11.

[†] Analect. lib. iii. p. 454.

[‡] Sermon 66. in Cant. sub. fin.

148.—*Inevitable condemnation of these Heretics, in that they denied their Religion.*

But what ought to put Protestants for ever out of conceit with all these impious sects, is the detestable custom they had of denying their religion, and partaking outwardly of our worship whilst they rejected it in their hearts. It is certain the Vaudois, like the Manicheans, lived in this practice ever since the beginning of the sect, till towards the midst of the last century. Seyssel* could not sufficiently wonder at the false piety of their Barbes, who condemning even the minutest lies, as so many grievous sins, yet dreaded not, in presence of the judges, to lie in point of faith, with an obstinacy so surprising, that the confession of it could scarcely be extorted from them by the most acute tortures. They forbade swearing, though even to bear witness to truth in courts of judicature; and at the same time stuck at no oath to conceal their sect and faith: a tradition they had received from the Manicheans, as they had also inherited from them their presumption and rancour. Men inure themselves to any thing, when once their guides have gained the ascendant over their minds; but especially when engaged in a cabal under the pretext of piety.

A HISTORY OF THE BOHEMIAN BRETHREN, VULGARLY AND FALSELY CALLED VAUDOIS.

149.—*The Sect of the Bohemian Brethren.*

We are now to speak of those who were falsely called Vaudois and Picards, and who called themselves the Brethren of Bohemia, or the Orthodox Brethren, or, barely, Brethren. They constitute a particular sect distinct from the Albigenses and the poor men of Lyons. When Luther rose up, he found some churches in Bohemia, and especially in Moravia, which he long detested. He approved afterwards of their confession of faith, corrected as we shall see. Bucer and Musculus have also bestowed great praises on them. The learned Camerarius, whom we have so much spoken of, that intimate friend of Melancthon, judged their history worthy to be written by his fine pen. His son-in-law, Rudiger†, though called by the

---

* F. 47.

† De Eccl. Frat. in. Boh. et Morr. narr. Hist. Heid. 1605.

Protestant churches of the Palatinate, preferred to them those of Moravia, and chose to be their minister; and of all the sects separated from Rome before Luther, this is the most commended by Protestants: but its birth and doctrine will soon evince nothing could be drawn from it to their advantage.

150.—*They disown those who call them Vaudois, and why.*

As for its birth, many, led into a mistake by the name, and some conformity of doctrine, make these Bohemians descend from the ancient Vaudois: but for their part, they renounce this origin*, as appears clearly in the preface they prefixed to their Confession of Faith in 1572. There they set forth their origin in an ample manner, and say, amongst other things, that the Vaudois are more ancient than they; that these had, indeed, some churches dispersed in Bohemia when their own began first to appear, but they had no acquaintance with them; that nevertheless these Vaudois, in process of time, made themselves known to them, yet refused, say they, to make any deep research into their doctrine. "Our annals," continue they, "inform us they were never united to our churches, for two reasons: first, because they gave no testimony of their faith and doctrine; secondly, because, in order to keep peace, they made no difficulty of assisting at masses celebrated by those of the Church of Rome." Whence they concluded, not only "that they never had entered into any union with the Vaudois, but also, that they had always believed they could not enter into any such with a safe conscience." So far are these people from acknowledging a Vaudois extraction, that what is eagerly sought for by the Calvinists is rejected by them with scorn.

151.—*The sentiments of Camerarius and Rudiger.*

Camerarius writes the same thing in his history of the Bohemian brethren †: but Rudiger ‡, one of their pastors in Moravia, says, still more clearly, that "these churches are far different from those of the Vaudois; that the Vaudois were in being ever since the year 1160, whereas the Brethren did not begin to appear till the fifteenth century; and finally, that it is written in the annals of the Brethren, how they always with constancy refused to make any union with the Vaudois, by reason they did not give a full Confession of their Faith, and went to mass."

---

* De orig. Eccl. Boh. et confess. ab iis editis. Heid. An. 1605, cum Hist. Joach. Camer. p. 173.

† Hist. p. 105, &c.

‡ Rudig. de Eccl. Frat. in Bohem. et Mor. nar. p. 147.

152.—*The Vaudois disowned by the Brethren as well as the Picards.*

Accordingly, we see the Brethren, in all their synods and all their acts, style themselves the Brethren of Bohemia, falsely called Vaudois*. The name of Picards is still more detested by them: "It is very likely," says Rudiger, "that those, who first gave it to our ancestors, took it from a certain Picard, who, renewing the ancient heresy of the Adamites, introduced nudities, and shameful actions; and as this heresy penetrated into Bohemia about the time our churches were established, they were discredited by so infamous a title, as if we had been nothing but the miserable remains of that impure Picard†." You see thereby how these two pedigrees, from the Vaudois and this Picard, are rejected by the Brethren; "they account it even an affront to be called Picard and Vaudois‡;" and if the first origin displeases them, the second, in which our Protestants glory, seems to them but little less shameful; but now we are going to see that which they give themselves is not much more reputable.

THE HISTORY OF JOHN WICKLIFF, AN ENGLISHMAN.

153.—*Wickliff's impious Doctrine in his Trialogue.*

They boast of being the disciples of John Huss; but to judge of their pretension, we must ascend higher still, since John Huss himself gloried in having Wickliff for his master. What judgment we then ought to pass on Wickliff shall be shewed in few words, without producing any other records than his own works, and the testimony of all candid Protestants.

The chief of all his works is the Trialogue, that famous book which set all Bohemia in a flame, and raised such troubles in England. This was the theology contained in it§, "That all happens by necessity: that he, a long while, spurned at this doctrine, because it was contrary to the liberty of God; but, at last, was obliged to yield, and acknowledge at the same time, that all the sins committed in the world are necessary and inevitable¶: that God could not prevent the sin of the first man, nor forgive it without Jesus Christ's satisfaction, but then it was impossible the Son of God should not become incarnate, should not satisfy, should not die: that God indeed might have done otherwise, had he willed it, but he could not will otherwise; that he could not but forgive man; that the sins of man proceeded from seduction and ignorance, and so it was requisite, of necessity, that the divine wisdom should put on flesh to repair them. That Jesus Christ could not save the devils; that their sin was a sin against the Holy Ghost [*]: that to save them, it would have been necessary the Holy Ghost should have become incarnate, which was absolutely impossible; therefore, that [†] no possible means were left of saving the devils in general. That nothing was possible to God, but what actually came to pass; that the power admitted for things, which did not happen, was an illusion. That God can produce nothing within himself, which he does not necessarily produce, nor out of himself, which he does not likewise necessarily produce in its time. That when Jesus Christ said, he could ask of his Father more than twelve legions of angels, you must understand he could if he would, but must acknowledge at the same time he could not will it [‡]. That the power of God is limited in the main, and is no otherwise infinite than because there is no greater power: in a word, that the world, and all which exists [§], is of absolute necessity, and were there anything possible that God should refuse a being to, he would be either impotent or envious; and as he could not refuse a being to anything capable thereof, so can he annihilate nothing [‖]. That we ought not to ask why God does not hinder sin—the reason is, because he cannot; nor, in general, why he does or does not such a thing—because he does necessarily all he can do; yet is he nevertheless free [¶], but in like manner, as he is free to produce his Son, whom nevertheless he produces necessarily. That the liberty, so called, of contradiction [**], whereby you may do a thing or not do it [††], is an erroneous term introduced by the doctors; and the imagination we have of our being free, is a perpetual illusion like to that of a child who thinks he walks alone whilst led: yet we deliberate [‡‡], we consult about our affairs, we damn our souls, but all this is inevitable, no less than all that is done or omitted in the world either by the creature [§§], or by God himself. That God has determined everything, and necessitates, as well the predestinated as the reprobate to all they do*, as also each particular creature to its several actions; and thence it happens that there are elect and reprobate; and thus it is not in God's power to save one single reprobate†. That he laughs at what is said in schools, *De sensu composito et diviso*, seeing that God can save none but such as are saved actually‡; that there is a necessary consequence for sinning if certain things fall out; that God wills these things to happen, and that this consequence be good, because otherwise it would not be necessary: so he wills you should sin, and wills sin on account of the good he draws from it; and although it does not please God that Peter should sin, yet the sin of Peter pleases him §: that God approves sinning; that he necessitates to sin. That man can do no better than he does; that sinners and the damned are nevertheless beholden to God, who shews mercy to the damned in giving them existence, which is more advantageous to, and to be wished for by, them than non-existence: that indeed, he dares not wholly ascertain this opinion, nor push men on to sin by teaching that it is agreeable to God they should thus sin, and that God allows it them as a recompense; he being aware‖ that the wicked might take occasion, from this doctrine, to commit grievous crimes, which, if they may, they will commit: but if no better reasons are given him than what are commonly alleged, he shall abide confirmed in his sentiment without uttering a word."

---

* In Syn. Sendom. Synt. Gen. part ii. p. 219.

† Rudig. Eccl. Frat. in Bohem. et Mor. nar. p. 148.

‡ Apo. 1532. ap. Lyd. l. ii. p. 137.

§ Lib. iii. c. vii. viii. xxiii. pp. 56, 82. Edit. 1525.

¶ Ibid. c. xxiv. xxv. p. 85, &c.

---

[*] Lib. c. xxvii. lib. i. c. x. p. 15.

[†] Ibid. c. xi. p. 18.

[‡] Ib. c. ii.

[§] Ibid. c. iv. Ibid. c. x. p. 16.

[‖] Ibid. c. iv. Ib. c. x. Lib. iii. c. ix.

[¶] Lib. i. c. x.

[**] Ib. c. xi.

[††] Ib. c. x.

[‡‡] Ibid. c. x.

[§§] Ib. lib. iii. c. ix.

You see thereby, he feels a secret horror of the blasphemies he vents; but he is hurried into them by the spirit of pride and singularity to which he had abandoned himself, nor does he know how to restrain the transports of his pen. This is a faithful extract of his blasphemies; they are reduced to two heads, to make a God over-ruled by necessity, and, what is a consequence from thence, a God, author and approver of all crimes; namely, a God whom the atheists would have reason to deny: so that the religion of so great a reformer is worse than atheism.

At the same time may be seen how many of his Dogmata were followed by Luther. As for Calvin and the Calvinists, we shall see them hereafter; nor, in this sense, is it in vain that they have reckoned this impious wretch among their predecessors.

---

* Lib. i. c. xiv. Lib. iii. c. iv. † Ibid. c. viii. ‡ Ib. c. iv.
§ Ib. c. vi. viii. Ib. c. iv. ‖ Ibid. c. viii.

154.—*He imitates the false piety of the Vaudois.*

In the midst of all these blasphemies, he was for imitating the false piety of the Vaudois, by attributing the effect of the sacraments to personal merit *: saying, " The keys did not operate except in the hands of holy persons; and those who do not imitate Jesus Christ cannot have the power of them: that, nevertheless, this power is not lost in the Church; that it subsists in the humble and unknown: that laymen may consecrate and administer the sacraments †: that it is a great crime in churchmen to possess temporal goods, a great crime in princes to have bestowed such on them, and not to employ their authority to take them from the clergy." Here you have in an Englishman, if I may be allowed to say it, the first pattern of the English Reformation, and church plundering. Some will say, it is self-interest we here combat for; no, we do but discover the mischievousness of extravagant minds, which, as we see, are capable of every excess.

155.—*Wickliff's Doctrine not calumniated at the Council of Constance.*

M. la Roque pretends, Wickliff was calumniated at the Council of Constance ‡, and that propositions, which he did not believe, were laid to his charge, this amongst the rest: " God is obliged to obey the Devil." But if we find so many blasphemies in one only work that remains of Wickliff, we may easily believe there were many others in his books, so very numerous at that time; and particularly as for this, it is a manifest consequence from the above doctrine, forasmuch as God, in all things acting by necessity, is drawn by the will of the devil to do certain things when obliged of necessity to concur to them.

156.—*Wickliff's pernicious Doctrine concerning Kings.*

Neither do we find, in the Trialogue, that proposition imputed to Wickliff §, " that a king ceased to be a king by the commission of a mortal sin." There were other books enough of Wickliff whence this might be taken. In fact we have a conference betwixt the Catholics of Bohemia and the Calixtins, in presence of King George Pogiebrac, wherein Hilary, dean of Prague, maintains to Roquesane*, chief of the Calixtins, that Wickliff had written in express terms, " that an old woman might be king and pope, were she better and more virtuous than the pope and king; and in such case she might say to the king, '*Rise up, I am more worthy* than thou to sit upon the throne.'" Upon Roquesane's answering this was not Wickliff's meaning, the same Hilary offered to shew these propositions to the whole assembly, and this besides †; " that whosoever is, by his virtue, the most praiseworthy, is also the most worthy in dignity, and the most holy old woman ought to be placed in the most holy employment." Roquesane stood mute, and the fact passed for incontestable.

---

* Lib. iv. c. x. xiv. xxiii. xxv. xxxii.

† Ibid. c. xvii. xviii. xix. xxiv.

‡ Hist. de Euch. Conc. Const. Sess. viii. prop. 6.

§ Ibid. prop. xv.

157.—*Such of Wickliff's Articles as were conformable to our Doctrine.*

The same Wickliff ‡ consented to the invocation of saints, honoured their images, acknowledged their merits, and believed in purgatory.

As for the Eucharist, what he most contended against was transubstantiation, which he said was the most detestable heresy that ever had been broached. Wherefore, it is his great article that bread is in this sacrament. With respect to the Real Presence, he has some things for, and some against it. He says, " The body is hidden in each morsel and crumb of bread." In another place, after saying, according to his cursed maxim, that the sanctity of the minister is necessary to a valid consecration, he adds, " you must presume for the sanctity of priests; but," says he, " on account that we have but a bare probability of it, I adore conditionally the host which I see, and adore absolutely Jesus Christ who is in heaven." He does not, therefore, doubt of the Presence, but inasmuch as he is not certain of the holiness of the minister, which he believes absolutely necessary thereto. Other suchlike passages may be found in him, but it is of little consequence to know more of them.

158.—*Wickliff's Confession of Faith produced by M. de la Roque, son of the Minister.*

A fact of greater importance is advanced by M. la Roque, junior §. He produces a confession of faith, wherein the Real Presence is clearly owned, and transubstantiation no less clearly rejected; but most material of all is what he affirms, that this confession of faith was proposed to Wickliff in the Council of London, where happened that great earthquake, called for that reason *concilium terræ motus;* some saying the earth had a horror of the bishop's decision, and others, of Wickliff's heresy.

---

* Disput. cum Rokys. apud. Canis. ant. lect. t. iii. p. ii. p. 474.

† Ibid. p. 500.

‡ Lib. iii. c. 30. Lib. xi. 14. Lib. iii. 5. iv. 6, 7, 40, 41. Lib. iv. 1, 6. Lib. iv. c. 1.

§ Nouv. acc. Cont. M. Varril. p. 73.

159.—*Proved false from Wickliff himself.*

But without further examination of this confession of faith, of which we shall speak with more certainty when we shall have seen it entire, I may venture to say beforehand, that it could not have been proposed to Wickliff by the council. I prove it from Wickliff himself*, who repeats four times, that "in the Council of London, where the earth trembled," *in suo concilio terræ motus;* it was defined in express term, "that the substance of bread and wine did not remain after consecration;" wherefore it is more clear than the day, that the confession of faith wherein is rejected this change of substance, can never be of this council.

160.—*Wickliff renounces his Doctrine and dies in the external Communion of the Church.*

I take M. la Roque for a man of too great sincerity not to yield to so clear a proof. Meanwhile, we are obliged to him for sparing us the trouble of proving here the faintheartedness of Wickliff; his recantation in the presence of the council; that "of his disciples, who at first had no more resolution than he; the shame he conceived at his dastardly comportment in departing from the notions then received†," which made him break off all commerce with men; so that, since his retractation, you hear no more mention of him; and, finally, his dying in his cure, and in the exercise of his function, which proves, as also does his burial in hallowed ground, that he died externally in the communion of the church.

I have, therefore, no more to do but conclude with this author, that Protestants can reap nothing but shame from Wickliff's conduct‡, "who either was an hypocritical prevaricator, or a Roman Catholic; who died in the church even whilst he assisted at the sacrifice accounted the mark of distinction between both parties."

---

* Lib. v. c. 36, 37, 38.

† La Roque, Ib. 70. Ib. pp. 81, 85, 88, 89, 90.

‡ La Roque, Ib.

161.—*Melancthon's sentiment concerning Wickliff.*

Those who have a mind to know Melancthon's opinion of Wickliff, will find it in the Preface to his 'Commonplaces,' where he says [*], "You may judge of Wickliff's spirit by the errors he abounds with. He understood nothing," says he, "of the justice of faith; he makes a jumble of gospel and politics; he maintains it unlawful for priests to have anything of their own; he speaks of the civil power after a seditious manner, and full of sophistry; with the same sophistry he cavils about the universally received opinion touching our Lord's Supper." This is what Melancthon said, after reading Wickliff. He would have said more, and not spared this author, as well deciding against free will, as making God the author of sin, had he not feared, in reproving him for these excesses, he should defame his master, Luther, under Wickliff's name.

THE HISTORY OF JOHN HUSS AND HIS DISCIPLES.

162.—*John Huss imitates Wickliff in his hatred of the Pope.*

What raised Wickliff to so high a station among the predecessors of our Refòrmed, was his teaching that the Pope was antichrist, and that ever since the year of our Lord one thousand, when Satan was to be let loose, according to St. John's prophesy, the church of Rome was become the whore of Babylon. John Huss, the disciple of Wickliff [†], has merited the same honours, in having so closely followed his master in this doctrine.

163.—*John Huss says Mass, and has no other sentiments in respect of the Eucharist than those of the Church of Rome.*

In other points he forsook him. Heretofore there was a dispute concerning his sentiments on the Eucharist. But the question is adjudged by our adversaries' consent; M. la Roque having shewn, in his history of the Eucharist [‡], from the authors of those times, from the testimony of Huss's first disciples, from his own writings, still extant, that he believed transubstantiation, and all the other articles of the Roman faith, not one excepted, unless communion under both kinds; and that he persisted in these sentiments even unto death.

---

[*] Præf. ad Mycon. Hosp. p. ii. ad An. 1350. f. 115.

[†] Wick. lib. iv. c. 1., &c.

[‡] Part ii. ch. xix. p. 464.

The same minister demonstrates the same thing in relation to Jerome of Prague, the disciple of John Huss, and the fact admits of no doubt.

164.—*Why Huss's Doctrine came to be doubted of.*

What gave occasion to doubt of John Huss, were some words he had uttered inconsiderately, and which were misunderstood, or retracted by him. But what more than all the rest caused him to be suspected in this matter was, the excessive praises he gave Wickliff, the enemy of transubstantiation. Wickliff, in reality, was the great doctor of John Huss and all the Hussite party: but certain it is, they did not follow his doctrine, crude as it was, but strove to explain it, as did John Huss, whom Rudiger* praises for having explained artfully, and courageously defended the sentiments of Wickliff. It was, therefore, agreed on in the party, that Wickliff, who, to speak the truth, was the head thereof, had carried matters much too far, and stood greatly in need of explanation. But however that may be, it is very certain John Huss gloried in his priesthood to the very last, and never intermitted saying mass when able.

165.—*John Huss a Catholic in all the controverted points, except Communion under both kinds, and the Pope's authority.*

M. la Roque, junior, upholds strenuously his father's sentiments; and is even sincere enough to own, that "they are displeasing to several of the party, and especially to the famous Mr. ———, who generally did not relish truths which had escaped his notice†." Every body knows it was Mr. Claude whose name he suppressed. But this young author carries his researches much farther than any Protestant had done before. None can any longer doubt, after the proofs which he alleges, that John Huss prayed to saints, honoured their images, acknowledged the merit of works, the seven sacraments, sacramental confession, and purgatory‡. The dispute chiefly turned on communion under both kinds; and, what was of the most importance, on that damnable doctrine of Wickliff, that authority, and especially ecclesiastical authority, was lost by sin; for John Huss maintained, on this head, things as extravagant as those advanced by Wickliff, and thence it was he drew his pernicious consequences.

---

* Rudig. Narr. p. 153. † Nouv. acc. cont. Varr. pp. 148, 150.
‡ Ib. p. 158, et seq. Conc. Const. Sess. xv. prop. 11, 12, 13, &c.

166.—*All goes down with Protestants, provided you inveigh against the Pope.*

If, with such a doctrine, and saying mass besides, every day to the end of his life, a man may not only be a true believer, but also a saint and martyr (as all Protestants proclaim John Huss, no less than Jerome of Prague, his disciple), there is no need of more disputing about fundamental articles: the only fundamental article is, to cry out amain against the Pope and Church of Rome; but if with Wickliff and John Huss you stretch so far as to call that church the Church of Antichrist, this doctrine is the remission of whatever sins, and covers all kind of errors.

167.—*The Taborites.*

Let us return to the Brethren of Bohemia, and see how they are the disciples of John Huss. Immediately after his condemnation and execution, two sects were seen to arise under his name, the sect of Calixtins and the sect of Taborites: the Calixtins under Roquesane, who by the joint consent of all, as well Catholic as Protestant authors, was, under the pretext of reformation, the most ambitious of all mankind: the Taborites under Zisca, whose sanguinary actions are not less known than his valour and success. Without inquiring into the doctrine of the Taborites, their rebellions and cruelty have made them odious to the greatest part of Protestants. Men that carried fire and sword into the bowels of their country for twenty years together, and whose marches may be traced by the blood and ashes they left behind, are not overqualified to be held for the principal defenders of the truth, nor to give an origin to Christian Churches*. Rudiger, who alone of the sect, for want of better knowledge, would have the Bohemian brethren descended from the Taborites†, acknowledges "that Zisca, pushed on by his particular enmities, carried the hatred he had against the monks and priests so far, that he not only set fire to churches and monasteries, wherein they served God, but also, in order to leave them no dwelling-place on earth, caused all the inhabitants of those places they possessed to be put to the sword." This is what Rudiger‡ says, an unsuspected author; to which he adds, that the brethren, whom he makes to descend from these barbarous Taborites, were ashamed of this parentage. Accordingly, they renounce it in all their Confessions of Faith and Apologies, and shew even it is impossible they should have sprung from the Taborites*, because at the time they began to appear, this sect, in a manner crushed by the death of its generals and the universal pacification of the Catholics and Calixtins (who united the whole powers of the state in order to demolish them), " held but in a lingering state till Pogiebrac and Roquesane entirely brought their miserable remains to destruction; insomuch," say they, " that no more Taborites, were left on earth," which is confirmed by Camerarius in his history †.

---

* De Frat. Narrat. p. 158. † Ib. 155. ‡ Ibid.

168.—*The Calixtins.*

The other sect, that prided itself in the name of John Huss, was that of the Calixtins, so called, because they believed the Chalice was absolutely necessary for the people. And it is undoubtedly from this sect that the Brethren proceeded in 1457, as they themselves declared in the preface to their Confession of Faith of 1558, and again, in that of 1572, so frequently cited by us, where they speak in these terms ‡, " Those who founded our Churches, separated themselves at that time from the Calixtins by a new separation;" their meaning was, as by them explained in their apology of 1532, that as the Calixtins had separated themselves from Rome, so the Brethren separated from the Calixtins; so that this was a schism and division, in another division and schism. But what were the causes for this separation? there is no comprehending them aright without knowing both the belief and condition the Calixtins were in at that time.

169.—*The Compactatum or Articles agreed to by the Council of Basil.*

Their doctrine at first consisted in four articles. The first concerned the cup; the other three regarded the correction of public and particular sins, which they carried to some excess; the free preaching of the word of God, which, they maintained, none could be precluded from; and Church-revenues. Herein was a smack of the Vaudois errors. These four articles were regulated in the council of Basil, after such a manner as the Calixtins were contented with, and the cup granted them on certain terms which they agreed to. This agreement was called Compactatum, a name famous in the history of Bohemia. But one part of the Hussites, not resting contented with these articles, began, under the name of Taborites, those bloody wars just mentioned; and the Calixtins, the other part of the Hussites, which had accepted the agreement, stood not to it; for instead of declaring, as they had agreed at Basil, that the cup was neither necessary nor commanded by Jesus Christ, they pressed the necessity thereof, even in regard to new-baptized children *. This point excepted, it is allowed the Calixtins agreed in all dogmata with the church of Rome, and their disputes with the Taborites prove as much. Lydius, a minister of Dort, has collected the acts thereof, which are not called in question by Protestants.

---

* Præf. Confess. 1572. seu. de orig. Eccl. Boh. &c. post.

† Hist. Camer. init. Præf. p. 176.

‡ Ib. p. 267. Præf Boh. Conf. 1558. Synt. Gen. p. 164. Apol. Frat. 1. part, ap. Lyd. t. ii. p. 129.

170.—*The Calixtins disposed to own the Pope.*

In them therefore it may be seen, that the Calixtins not only allow transubstantiation, but also with relation to the Eucharist, all and every part of the doctrine and usages received in the church of Rome, communion only under both kinds excepted; and should that be granted by the Pope, they were ready to acknowledge his authority †.

171.—*Wherefore then did they so much respect the memory of Wickliff?*

Here the query might be put, their sentiments being such, how they could retain so great a respect for Wickliff as to call him by excellence, as the Taborites did, the evangelical doctor? the reason in short was, because we find nothing regular in these separated sects. Although Wickliff had inveighed with all the passion imaginable against the church of Rome, and in particular against transubstantiation, the Calixtins excused him ‡, by answering, what he had said against this dogma was not spoken decisively but scholastically, by way of dispute; whereby we may judge how easy a matter they found it to justify, say what you would, an author with whom they were infatuated.

172.—*The ambition of Roquesane and the Calixtins hinders their reunion with the Church.*

For all that, they were not the less disposed to submit to the Pope's authority, and Roquesane's interests alone prevented their reunion. This doctor himself had been contriving the reconciliation, in hopes, after so great a service, that the Pope would be easily inclined to confer on him the archbishopric of Prague, which he much ambitioned *. But the Pope, unwilling to trust the care of souls and depositum of faith to so factious a person, invested Budvix with this prelacy, as much Roquesane's superior in merit as in birth. This ruined all. Bohemia saw herself reinvolved in more bloody wars than ever. Roquesane, in spite of the Pope, set himself up for archbishop of Prague, or rather for Pope in Bohemia; nor could Pogiebrac, whom he had raised to the throne by his intrigues, refuse him any thing.

---

* Lyd. Wald. t. 1. Rotero. 1616.

† Syn. Prague. An. 1431. ap. Lyd. p. 304. et An. 1434. Ibid. pp. 332, 354.

‡ Ibid. p. 472.

173.—*Origin of the Bohemian Brethren, who separate from Roquesane and the Calixtins.*

During these disturbances, the tradesmen who had begun to grumble in the precedent reign, set themselves more than ever to confer among themselves concerning the Reformation of the Church. The mass, transubstantiation, prayer for the dead, the veneration of saints, but especially the power of the Pope, were offensive to them. In fine, they complained that the "Calixtins romanized in every thing except the cup †." They undertook to correct them. Roquesane, incensed against the holy see, seemed to them a proper instrument to manage this affair ‡. Shocked with his haughty answer, which savoured of nothing but love of this world, they reproached him with his ambition; that he was a mere worldling, who would sooner abandon them than his honours. At the same time they placed at their head one Kelesiski, a master shoemaker, who drew up for them a body of Doctrine called the Forms of Kelesiski. Afterwards they chose themselves a pastor named Matthias Convalde, a lay and ignorant person; and in 1467, divided openly from the Calixtins, as the Calixtins had done from Rome. Such was the birth of the Bohemian brethren; and this is what Camerarius and they themselves, as well in their Annals as in their Apologies and Prefaces to their Confessions of Faith, relate of their origin, except that they date their separation from the year 1457; and it seems to me more proper to fix it ten years after, in 1467, at the time they themselves date the creation of their new pastors.

---

* Cam. Hist. Narr. Apol. Frat. p. 115, &c.

† Apol. 1532. part 1.

‡ Camer. de Eccl. Frat. pp. 64, 84, &c. Apol. Frat. 1532. part 1.

174.—*Weak beginnings of this Sect.*

I find here some little contradiction betwixt what they relate of their history in their Apology of 1532, and what they say in the Preface of 1572 [*]. For they say in this preface that in 1457, at the time they separated from the Calixtins, they were a people collected from all manner of degrees: and in their Apology of 1532, wherein they were somewhat less assuming, they own frankly [†], they were made up "of the meaner sort, and of some Bohemian priests in small number, all put together but a handful of men, a small remnant, and the despicable refuse," or, translate it as you please, "*Miserabilis quisquiliæ*, left in the world by John Huss." Thus did they separate from the Calixtins, that is, from the only Hussites then in being. Thus it is that they are the disciples of John Huss; a piece broken from a piece; a schism cut off from a schism; Hussites divided from Hussites, and retaining scarce any thing of them but their disobedience and rupture from the church of Rome.

175.—*They only took the name of John Huss, and followed not his Doctrine.*

Should it be asked, how they could own John Huss, as they every where do, for an Evangelical doctor, for a holy martyr, for their master, and the apostle of the Bohemians, and at the same time reject, as sacrilegious, the Mass, which their apostle constantly said to the last, Transubstantiation, and the other dogmata he had always adhered so closely to: their answer is [‡], "that John Huss had but begun the re-establishment of the gospel," and they believed, "had time been given him, he would have changed a great deal more." Still he failed not to be a martyr and apostle, though he persevered, according to them, in such damnable practices, and the Brethren celebrated his martyrdom in their Churches the eighth of July, as we are informed by Rudiger [§].

176.—*Their extreme ignorance, and their presumption in pretending to re-baptize the whole world.*

Camerarius [||] acknowledges their extreme ignorance, but says what he can in excuse thereof. This we may hold for certain, that God wrought no miracles to enlighten them. So many ages after the question of rebaptizing heretics had been determined by the unanimous consent of the whole Church, they were so ignorant as to re-baptize "all those that came to them from other Churches." They persisted in this error for the space of a hundred years, as they own in all their writings, and confess in the preface of 1558, that it was but a little while since they were undeceived *. This error ought not to be deemed of trivial importance, since it amounted to this, that Baptism was lost in the Universal Church, and remained only amongst them. Thus presumptuous in their notions were two or three thousand men, who had more or less equally revolted against the Calixtins, amongst whom they had lived, and against the church of Rome, from which both of them had divided thirty or forty years before. So small a parcel of another parcel, dismembered so few years ago from the Catholic Church, dared to re-baptize the remainder of the universe, and reduce the inheritance of Jesus Christ to a corner of Bohemia! They believed themselves therefore the only Christians, since they believed that they only were baptized; and whatever they might allege in their own vindication, their re-baptization condemned them. All they had to answer was, if they re-baptized the Catholics, the Catholics also re-baptized them. But it is well enough known, that the church of Rome never re-baptized any that had been baptized by any person whatsoever, "in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" and supposing there had been, in Bohemia, such very ignorant Catholics as not to know so notorious a thing, ought not they, who called themselves their Reformers, to know better? After all, how came it to pass that these new re-baptizers did not cause themselves to be re-baptized? If, at their coming into the world, Baptism had ceased throughout all Christendom, that which they had received was no higher in value than that of their neighbours, and by invalidating the Baptism of those by whom they were baptized, what became of their own? They were then obliged no less to cause themselves to be re-baptized, than to re-baptize the rest of the universe: and in this there was but one inconveniency; namely, that, according to their principles, there was not a man on earth that could do them this good turn, Baptism being equally null whatever side it came from. Thus it is when a shoemaker commences Reformer, one, as themselves acknowledge in a Preface to

---

[*] De orig. Eccl. Boh. post. Hist. Camer. p. 267. part i.

[†] Apol. Lyd. t. ii. 221, 222, 232, &c.

[‡] Apo. 1532, part i. ap. Lyd. t. ii. pp. 116, 117, 118, &c.

[§] Rud. Narr. post. Camer. Hist. p. 151.

[||] Cam. Hist. Narr. p. 102. Præf. Apol. 1538. apud Lyd. t. ii. p. 105.

---

* Cam. Hist. Apol. part iv. p. 274. Conf. fid. 1558. Art. xii. Synt. Gen. p. 195. Ibid. p. 170.

their Confession of Faith*, that knew not a word of Latin, and was no less presumptuous than ignorant. These are the men whom Protestants admire. Does the question turn on condemning the church of Rome?—they never cease to upbraid her with the ignorance of her priests and monks. Is the question regarding the ignorant individuals of these latter ages, who have set up for reforming the Church by schism?—they are fishermen turned apostles: although their ignorance stand eternally on record, from the first step they took. No matter; if we believe the Lutherans in the Preface they placed before the Brethren's Apology, and printed at Wittemberg in Luther's time; if, I say, we believe them, it was in this ignorant society, in this handful of men, that "The Church of God was preserved when she was thought entirely lost†."

177.—*Their fruitless search over all the universe after a Church of their Belief.*

Nevertheless, these remains of the Church, these depositaries of the ancient Christianity, were themselves ashamed that they could not discover in the whole universe a Church of their belief. Camerarius informs us‡, that it entered into their thoughts at the beginning of their separation, to make inquiry if they could find, in some place of the earth, and chiefly in Greece or Armenia, or some other part of the east, that Christianity, of which the west was utterly bereft according to their sentiments. At that time, many Grecian priests, who had fled to Bohemia from the sacking of Constantinople, and to whom Roquesane gave reception in his own house, had leave to celebrate the holy mysteries according to the rites of their Church. Therein the Brethren beheld their own condemnation, and beheld it still more in conversing with those priests. But notwithstanding these Grecians assured them it was in vain for them to travel into Greece in quest of Christians formed to their mode, whom they never would find; yet they appointed three deputations of able and discreet persons, whereof some traversed all the east, others went northwards into Muscovy, and others turned their course towards Palestine and Egypt; whence all meeting at Constantinople, according to the project concerted by them, they returned at last to Bohemia, and all the answer they brought to their brethren was, that they might depend upon it there were none of their profession in the whole universe.

---

* Conf. fid. 1558. Synt. Gen. part ii. p. 164.

† Joan. Euseb. in ora. præfixâ Apo. frat. sub hoc titulo: Œconomiâ, &c. ap. Lyd. t. ii. p. 95.

‡ De Eccl. Frat. p. 91.

178.—*How they sought Orders in the Catholic Church.*

Their solitude, thus destitute of all succession and lawful ordination, raised such a horror in them, that even in Luther's time they sent some of their people, who surreptitiously stole Ordination from the Church of Rome; we learn this from one of Luther's treatises, which is quoted in another place. A poor church indeed, which, void of the principle of fecundity left by Jesus Christ to the apostles and their legitimate successors, were forced to intrude themselves amongst us to beg, or rather to purloin, sacred orders.

179.—*Reproaches made them by Luther.*

Besides, they were upbraided by Luther* that they knew nothing, no more than John Huss, of Justification, the very principal point of the Gospel; for they "placed it," he proceeds, "in faith and works together, as many fathers had done; and John Huss was wedded to this opinion." He was in the right; for neither the Fathers, nor John Huss, nor his master Wickliff, neither orthodox, nor heretics, nor Albigenses, nor Vaudois, had ever, before him, dreamed of his "imputed justice." Wherefore he despised the Brethren of Bohemia†, "as men serious, rigid, of an austere countenance, that martyred themselves with the law and works, and never enjoyed a cheerful conscience." Thus did Luther treat the most regular, to all appearance, of all the schismatic Reformers, and, as was said, the sole remnant of the true Church. But he had soon reason to be satisfied with them: the Brethren carried Lutheran Justification so far, as to run blindly into the excesses of Calvinists, and even into such as the Calvinists now-a-days strive to clear themselves from. The Lutherans would have us justified without our co-operation, and without our having part therein. The Brethren added ‡, it was even "without our knowledge and feeling it, as an embryo is quickened in its mother's womb." After our regeneration, God begins to make himself felt; and if Luther would have us know with certainty our Justification, the brethren still further would have us entirely and indubitably assured of our perseverance and salvation. They went so far with the imputation of justice as to say, that "sins, how enormous so ever, were but venial," provided you committed them "with repugnance," and that it was of these sins St. Paul said,

---

* Luth. Coll. p. 286. Edit. of Franc. an. 1676. † Ibid.

‡ Apol. part iv. ap. Lyd. t. ii. p. 244, 248. Ibid. part ii. 172, 173. part iv. p. 282. Ibid. part ii. p. 168.

"there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus [*]."

180.—*Their Doctrine concerning the Seven Sacraments.*

The Brethren had, like us, Seven Sacraments in the Confession of 1504, which was presented to King Ladislaus. They proved them from the Scriptures, and acknowledged them "established for the accomplishment of the promises God had made to the faithful." They must have preserved this doctrine of the Seven Sacraments even in Luther's days, since he blamed them for it. The Confession of Faith was therefore reformed, and the Sacraments reduced to two: Baptism and the Supper, as Luther had ordained. Absolution was acknowledged, but not in quality of a Sacrament. In 1504, they spoke of the confession of sins as a thing of obligation. This obligation does no longer appear so express in the reformed Confession, where it is merely said, "You ought to demand of the priest absolution of your sins by the keys of the Church, and obtain the forgiveness of them by this ministry ordained for that end by Jesus Christ[†]."

181.—*Concerning the Real Presence.*

As for the Real Presence, the defenders of the literal and the figurative sense have equally striven to turn to their advantage the Bohemian Confessions of Faith[‡]. For my part, the thing being indifferent to me, I shall only report their words, and here is what at first they wrote to Roquesane, as they themselves set forth in their Apology: "We believe that we receive the body and blood of our Lord under the species of bread and wine." And a little further on: "We are none of those who, ill understanding the words of our Lord, say, he has given us consecrated bread as a memorial of his body, which he pointed at with his finger, saying, 'This is my body.' Others say, this bread is the body of our Lord who is in heaven, but significatively. All these expositions appear to us far remote from Jesus Christ's intention, and are very displeasing to us."

182.—*Sequel.*

In their Confession of Faith of the year 1504, they speak thus: "As often as a worthy priest, with a faithful people, pronounces these words, 'This is my body, this is my blood,' the bread present is the body of Jesus Christ which was offered for us to death, and the wine his blood shed for us; and this body and this blood are present under the species of bread and wine in memory of his death." And to shew the firmness of their faith, they add, they would believe as much of a stone, had Jesus Christ said it was his body*.

---

[*] Rom. viii. 1.

[†] Conf. fid. apud Lyd. t. iii. p. 8. et seq. citat. in Apol. 1531. ap. eund. Lyd. 296. t. ii. Ihen. Germ. liv. de l'ador. p. 229, 230. Ibid. Art. xi. xii. xiii. Ib. Art. v. xiv. Pref. fid. ad Lad. c. de pœnitent. laps. ap. Lyd. t. ii. p. 15.

[‡] Apol. 1532, part iv. ap. Lyd. p. 295.

183.—*They make the Sacrament depend on the merit of the Minister.*

Hitherto we see the same language as is used by Catholics; we see the body and blood "under the species" immediately after the words, and we see them there, not in figure, but in truth. What they have peculiar to them, is their requiring these words should be pronounced by a worthy priest. This is what they add to the Catholic doctrine. To accomplish the work of God in the Eucharistic bread, Jesus Christ's words did not suffice, but the minister's merit was also necessary; this is what they had learnt from John Wickliff and John Huss.

184.—*Strong expression in favour of the Reality.*

They repeat the same thing in another place†: "When," say they, "a worthy priest prays with his faithful people, and says, 'This is my body, this is my blood,' immediately the bread present is the same body which was given up to death, and the wine present is his blood which was shed for our redemption." It is therefore plain they change nothing in the Catholic doctrine as to the real presence; on the contrary, they seem to make choice of the strongest terms to confirm it, by saying, "that immediately after the words, the bread is the true body of Jesus Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin, and was to be given up to crucifixion; and the wine his true natural blood, the same which was to be shed for our sins, and all this without delay, at the very instant, with a presence most real and true, *præsentissimè*, as they speak." And the figurative sense appeared to them, say they, "so odious in one of their synods, that a certain person called John Czizco, one of theirs who had dared to maintain it, was expelled out of their communion." They add that divers writings have been published by them against this presence in sign, and those that defend it hold them for their adversaries, call them Papists, Antichrists, and Idolaters*.

---

* Prof. fid. ad Lad. c. de Euch. ap. Lyd. t. ii. p. 10. citat. Apol. part iv. Ib. 296. Ibid. p. xii.

† Apol. ad Lad. Ibid. 42. Prof. fid. ad Lad. Ibid. p. 27. Apol. p. 66, etc.

185.—*The same thing confirmed.*

Another proof of their sentiment is a saying of theirs, "that Jesus Christ is present in the bread and wine by his body and blood; otherwise," proceed they, "neither those that are worthy would receive any thing but bread and wine, nor those that are unworthy would be guilty of the body and blood, it being impossible they should be guilty of what is not there†." Whence it follows that they are there, not only for the worthy, but also for the unworthy.

186.—*Their manner of refusing Adoration confirms their Belief of the Reality, even out of the Reception.*

True it is, they are against our adoring Jesus Christ in the Eucharist for two reasons: first, because he has not commanded it; secondly, because there are two presences of Jesus Christ, his personal, corporeal, and sensible presence, which ought to attract our adoration; and his spiritual or sacramental presence, which ought not to attract it. But for all this, they nevertheless acknowledge the substance of the body of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament: "we are not commanded," say they, "to honour this substance of the body of Jesus Christ consecrated, but the substance of Jesus Christ which is at the right hand of the Father‡." Here, then, have you, in the Sacrament and in heaven, the substance of Jesus Christ's body, but adorable in heaven and not so in the sacrament. And, lest you should wonder at this, they add, "that Jesus Christ would not even oblige men to adore him on earth when he was there present, because he waited the time of his glory §;" which shews their intention was not to exclude the substantial presence, when they exclude adoration; on the contrary, they supposed it, since, had they not believed it, they would have had no manner of occasion to excuse themselves for not adoring in the Sacrament what, in reality, was not there.

Let us not inquire of them now, whence they learnt this rare doctrine; that, to adore Jesus Christ, it is not sufficient we know him present, and that it was not his intention we should adore him on earth, but only in his glory: I am satisfied with relating what they say of the Real Presence, nay, of the Real Presence not after the manner of the Melancthonists, in the sole use, but immediately after the Consecration.

---

* Apol. 1532, part iv. p. 290. Ib. p. 298. Ibid. p. 291, 299. † Ibid. 309.
‡ Ap. ad Lad. p. 67, et alibi passim. Ibid. p. 301, 306, 307, 309, 311, etc.
§ Ibid. p. 67. Prof. fid. ad Lad. p. 29. Apol. ad eund. p. 68.

187.—*Their uncertainty and affected Ambiguities.*

With these expressions apparently so distinct and so decisive for the Real Presence, in other places they confound themselves after so strange a manner, that it seems as if they feared nothing so much as leaving a clear and certain testimony of their faith: for they repeat continually that Jesus Christ is not in the Eucharist in person [*]. It is true, they call his being there in person, being there sensibly and corporally: expressions which they always link together, and oppose to a spiritual manner of being, acknowledged by them. But what casts them into a new confusion, is that they seem to say [†], Jesus Christ is present in the Eucharist with this spiritual Presence, as he is in Baptism and in preaching the word, as he was eaten by the ancient Hebrews in the desert, as St. John Baptist was Elias. Nor do I comprehend what they mean by this odd expression [‡]: Jesus Christ is not here "with his natural body after an existing and corporeal manner, *existenter et corporaliter*," but is here [§] "spiritually, powerfully, by way of benediction, and in virtue; *spiritualiter potenter, benedictè, in virtue*." What they add is not intelligible, that "Jesus Christ is here in the abode of benediction," to wit, according to their language, he is in the Eucharist, "as he is at the right hand of God, but not as he is in the heavens." If he be there as he is at the right hand of God, he is there in person. Thus naturally should one conclude: but how shall we distinguish the heavens from the right hand of God? there we are at a loss. The Brethren spoke distinctly when they said [||]: "There is but one Lord, Jesus Christ, who is the same in the Sacrament with his natural body, but who is after another manner at the right hand of his Father: for it is one thing to say, there is Jesus Christ, this is my body; and another to say, he is there after such a manner." But no sooner had they expressed themselves in plain terms, than they bewilder themselves in strange subtilized notions, into which they are plunged by the confusion and uncertainty of their minds and thoughts, together with a vain desire of contenting both parties of the Reformation.

---

[*] Apol. ad Ladis. Ib. p. 68, 69, &c. 71, 73. Ibid. p. 301, 306, 307, 309, 311, &c.

[†] Ibid. p. 302, 304, 307, 308.

[‡] Ibid. 74.

[§] Ibid.

[||] Ibid. p. 71.

188.—*The Lutherans and Calvinists both strive to draw them to their side.—They incline to the first.*

The more forward they advanced, the more important and mysterious they became; and as the Lutherans and Calvinists strove each to gain them, so they also, on their side, seemed inclined to content both parties. At length, this is what they said in 1558, and what they appeared resolved to stand by *. They complain, at first, they were accused "of not believing that the presence of the true body and true blood was present." What odd expressions, presence to be present! thus they speak in the preface: but teach in the body of the Confession, that it ought to be acknowledged that the bread is the true body of Jesus Christ, and the cup his true blood, without adding any thing of your own to his words. But whilst they forbid adding any thing to the words of Jesus Christ, they themselves add to them the word true, which is not there; and whereas Jesus Christ said, "This is my body," they suppose he said, "This bread is my body;" a very different thing, as elsewhere you may have seen. Now if it were allowable in them to add what they judged necessary to denote a true presence, it was no less allowable in others to add also what was requisite to remove all ambiguity; and to reject these expressions after disputes had arisen, was opposing light, and leaving the questions undecided. It was for this reason Calvin † wrote to them, that he could not approve of their obscure and captious brevity, and required them to explain how the bread is the body of Jesus Christ; which, should they fail to do, he maintained their confession of faith could not be subscribed without peril, and would occasion great disputes. But Luther was satisfied with them, as they approximated near to his expressions, and were more inclined towards the confession of Augsburg. For they even continued to complain of those ‡, who denied that the bread and wine were the true body and true blood of Jesus Christ, and who called them Papists, Idolaters, and Antichrists, on account of their acknowledging the true presence. Finally, to shew how far they were leaning to the side of the Real Presence, they enjoin their ministers, in distributing this sacrament §, and in reciting the words of our Lord, "to exhort the people to believe that the presence of Jesus Christ is present;" and in this view they enjoin, likewise, although in other respects little inclined to adoration, "That the sacrament be received kneeling."

---

* Apol. ad Ladis. p. 162.

† Calv. Ep. ad Wald. p. 312, et seq.

‡ Ibid. 195.

§ Ibid. 396.

189.—*Luther gives them his approbation, and how.*

By thus expounding and thus palliating as already seen, they so contented Luther, that he prefixed his approbation to a confession of faith published by them *, declaring, however, "That for this time they not only appeared more adorned, more free, and more polished, but also more considerable and better;" which sufficiently intimates, he approved their confession only inasmuch as it had been reformed agreeably to his maxims.

190.—*Their Festivals, their Churches, their Fasts, the Celibacy of their Priests.*

It does not appear that any uneasiness was given them in regard of the stated fasts preserved amongst them, nor in regard of the festivals they celebrated, forbidding all labour: not only in honour of our Lord, but also of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints. They were not upbraided that this was observing days contrary to the precept of the Apostle, nor that these holy days in honour of the saints were so many acts of idolatry. Neither were they accused of raising churches to saints, under pretext they continued, as we do, to name the Church of the Virgin, *in Templo divæ Virginis*, of St. Peter, of St. Paul, churches consecrated to God in memory of them. They are likewise suffered to enjoin their priests celibacy, and degrade them from priesthood upon marrying, for this unquestionably was their practice no less than that of the Taborites †. All this is harmless in the Brethren; in us only every thing is rank poison.

191.—*The perpetual Virginity of Mary, Mother of God.*

I would also have them asked, where they find in Scripture what they say of the blessed Virgin: "That she was a Virgin before and after her delivery ‡." It is true, this was the belief of the holy fathers, and the contrary rejected by them for no less than an execrable blasphemy: yet does it, nevertheless, evince that many things may be accounted blasphemies, the contrary to which is nowhere in holy writ; so that, when they boast of speaking nothing but from Scripture, they really mean no more by it than that it serves their turn to talk in this strain: nor is this apparent respect for the Scripture anything in them but a blind to the ignorant and simple.

---

* P. 211.

† Art. xv. xvii. Act. Syn. Torin. 1595. Syn. part ii. p. 240, 242. Art. ix. Æn. Silv. Hist. Boh. ap. Lyd. p. 395, 405.

‡ Orat. Enc. ap. Lyd. p. 30. Art. xvii. p. 201.

192.—*They fly for shelter into Poland.*

It is averred that these Bohemian brethren (whose words were so meek and respectful in regard of higher powers) the more they engaged in the Lutheran sentiments, so likewise the more did they enter into their intrigues and wars. Ferdinand found them mingled in the Elector of Saxony's rebellion against Charles the Fifth, and drove them from Bohemia[*]. They took sanctuary in Poland, and it appears, from a letter of Musculus to the Protestants of Poland, in 1556, that it was but a few years since these fugitives from Bohemia were received into that kingdom.

193.—*There they unite with the Lutherans and Zuinglians in the Assembly of Sendomir.*

Some time after this, the union of the three Protestant sects of Poland was brought about, namely, of the Lutherans, the Bohemians, and the Zuinglians. The act of union was passed in 1570, at the Synod of Sendomir, and bears this title: "The union and mutual agreement made between the Churches of Poland; to wit, between those of the Augsburg Confession, those of the Confession of the Bohemian Brethren, and those of the Confession of the Helvetic churches, or Zuinglians[†]." In this act the Bohemians style themselves the Brethren of Bohemia, whom the ignorant call Vaudois. It appears then manifestly that the question here was about those Vaudois who, by mistake, were named so, as we have shewn, and who accordingly disclaim this origin. For, with respect to the ancient Vaudois, we learn from an old author[‡], that there were scarce any of them in the kingdom of Cracovia, namely in that of Poland, no more than in England, in the Low Countries, in Denmark, in Sweden, in Norway, and in Prussia; and since this author's time, this little number is so dwindled away to nothing, that, in all these countries, we hear no more mention of them.

---

[*] Syntag. Gen. part ii. p. 212.

[†] Ibid. pp. 218, 219.

[‡] Pylic. cont. Wald. c. 15. t. iv. Bib. PP. part ii. p. 785.

194.—*Terms of the Sendomir Agreement.*

The agreement was made in these terms. In order to explain therein the point concerning the Supper, the whole article of the Saxonic Confession, where this matter is handled, was there transcribed. We have seen that Melancthon drew up this Confession in 1551, in order to have it presented at Trent. In it was said, that "Jesus Christ is truly and substantially present in the Communion, and is given truly to those who receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ*." To which they add, in a strange manner of expression, "That the substantial presence of Jesus Christ is not only signified, but truly rendered present, distributed, and given to those who eat; the signs not being naked, but joined to the thing itself, agreeably to the nature of the sacraments†."

195.—*In this agreement the Zuinglians, more than all the rest, recede from their particular tenets.*

"The substantial presence," it seems, was had very much at heart, when, in order to inculcate it the more forcibly, they said, it was not only signified but truly present; but I always distrust these strong expressions of the Reformation, which the more she diminishes the truth of the body and blood in the Eucharist, the more rich is she always in words; as if she could repair by them the loss she sustains in things. Now, when you come to the point, although this declaration abounds with equivocal expressions, and leaves subterfuges to each party whereby to preserve their particular doctrine; it is, nevertheless, the Zuinglians that take the greatest step, since whereas they said in their confession that the body of our Lord being in heaven absent from us, becomes present to us only by its virtue, the terms of the agreement import, that Jesus Christ is substantially present to us; and notwithstanding all the rules of human language, a presence in virtue becomes immediately a presence in substance.

196.—*Wherein the Lutherans recede, yet may still come off.*

There are terms in the agreement which it were difficult for the Lutherans to reconcile to their doctrine, did not men inure themselves, in the new Reformation, to expound every thing to their own sense. For instance, they seem much to depart from the belief they are in, that the body of Jesus Christ is taken by the mouth even by the unworthy, when they say in this agreement, "The signs of the Supper given by Faith to the Believers, what they signify*." But, besides that they may say they spoke in this manner, by reason that the real presence is not known but by faith; they may also add that, in fact, there are blessings in the Supper which are given to the believers only, as life eternal, and the nourishment of the soul, and it is those they mean when they say, "The signs given by Faith, what they signify."

---

* V. sup. lib. viii. n. 18. Syn. Conf. part i. p. 166. part ii. p. 72.
† Conf. p. 146.

197.—*Disposition of the Bohemian Brethren.*

I do not wonder the Bohemians signed this agreement without difficulty. Separated about forty or fifty years before from the Catholic church, and reduced to allow Christianity in no part of the world except a corner of Bohemia, which they inhabited, upon seeing the Protestants appear, all they thought of was to support themselves with their protection. They knew how to gain Luther by their submission; by equivocating, they had all that could be desired from Bucer; the Zuinglians suffered themselves to be soothed by the general expressions of the Brethren, who said, yet without practising it, that nothing ought to be added to the words our Saviour used. The most difficult to be pleased was Calvin. We have seen in the letter† he wrote to the Bohemian Brethren, who had taken refuge in Poland, how he blamed the ambiguity of their confession of faith, and declared there was no subscribing it without opening an inlet to dissension or error.

198.—*Reflections on this Union.*

Contrary to his judgment, all was subscribed, the Helvetic Confession, the Bohemian, and the Saxonic, the presence of substance together with that of virtue only; namely, the two contrary doctrines with their equivocations favouring them both. All whatever they pleased was added to our Lord's words, even at the time they ratified the Confession of Faith, wherein was laid down for a maxim, that nothing ought to be added to them: all passed, and a peace was concluded by this means. You see how all the sects, divided from Catholic unity, separate and unite among themselves; separating from the chair of St. Peter, they separate from one another, and bear the just punishment of despising the band of their unity.

---

* Conf. p. 164.

† Ep. ad Wal. p. 317.

When they re-unite in appearance, they are never the more united in the main; and their union, cemented only by political interests, serves but to evidence, by a new proof, that they have not so much as the idea of Christian unity, since they never do unite in one accord, in one mind, as St. Paul ordains*.

199.—*General Reflections on the history of all these Sects.*

May it be allowed us at present to make a few reflections on this history of the Vaudois, the Albigenses, and the Bohemians. You see whether the Protestants were right in reckoning them among their ancestors; whether this extraction be to their credit; and in particular whether they ought to have looked on Bohemia, since the time of John Huss, as the mother of the reformed churches†. It is clearer than the sun, on one side, that they only bring in these sects from the necessity of finding witnesses in the foregoing ages for what they believe to be the truth; and on the other, that nothing is more despicable than to allege such witnesses as are all convicted of falsehood in capital points, and who, in the main, neither agree with Protestants, nor with us, nor with themselves. This is the first reflection Protestants should make.

200.—*Another Reflection, that these so contrary Sects all ground themselves on the evidence of Scripture.*

The second is of no less importance. They ought to consider that all these sects, so different from one another, and withal so opposite as well to us as to Protestants, agree with them in the common principle of guiding themselves by the Scriptures: not, indeed, as the church in all times has understood and still understands them—for this is a most certain rule; but as every man of himself is capable of understanding them. This is what has produced all those errors and all those contrarieties which we have observed. Under the pretext of Scripture, every man has followed his own notions; and the Scripture, taken in this way, so far from uniting minds, has divided them, and made every one worship the delusions of his own brain, under the name of eternal verities.

201.—*Last and most important Reflection concerning the accomplishment of St. Paul's prediction.*

But there still remains the last and by much the most important reflection to be made on all these things we have just seen in this contracted history of the Albigenses and Vaudois. There we discover the reason of the Holy Ghost's inspiring St. Paul with this prophecy: "the spirit speaketh expressly, that, in the latter times, some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer*." All the holy fathers are agreed that this is meant of the impious sect of Marcionites and Manicheans, who taught two principles, and attributed to the *evil* one the creation of the universe; which made them detest the propagation of mankind, and the use of many kinds of food which they believed unclean and bad in their nature, as being produced by a creator who himself was bad and impure. St. Paul points, therefore, at these accursed sects by these two their so noted tenets; and without previously mentioning the principle whence they drew these two evil consequences, he expresses the two sensible characters whereby we have seen these infamous sects were known in all times.

---

* Philip. ii. 2.

† Jur. Avis aux Protes. de l'Europe at the beginning of his Prejug. legit. p. 9.

202.—*The Doctrine of two Principles pointed at by St. Paul: why this Doctrine is called the Doctrine of Devils.*

But although St. Paul does not immediately express the deep cause why these deceivers forbade the use of two things so natural, he denotes it sufficiently further on, when he says, in opposition to these errors, that "every creature of God is good†," overthrowing by this principle the detestable sentiment of those that descried impurity in the works of God, and making us withal sensible that the root of this lay in not knowing the creation, and in blaspheming the Creator. Accordingly, it is what St. Paul calls, in particular, more than all other doctrines, "the doctrine of devils‡," there being nothing more suitable to the jealousy against God and against men of these seducing spirits, than to attack the creation, condemn God's works, blaspheme against the author of the law and the law itself, and defile human nature with all manner of impurities and illusions. For this is what Manicheism consisted in, and what truly is the very doctrine of devils; especially if you add these enchantments and impostures, which all authors testify were so frequently made use of in this sect. To wrest now the so plain and so natural sense of St. Paul, against those who, acknowledging both marriage and all sort of meats for the work and institution of God, yet abstain voluntarily from them to mortify the senses and purify the mind, is a too manifest delusion, and one which we have seen long ago exploded by the fathers. It is, then, very perceptible whom St. Paul aimed at, nor is it possible to mistake those he has so accurately described by their proper characters.

---

* 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

† Ibid. 4.

‡ Ibid. 1.

203.—Query, *why the Holy Ghost, of all heresies, has only in particular foretold Manicheism.—Character of this heresy.—Hypocrisy.—Spirit of Lying.—Conscience cauterized.*

Why the Holy Ghost, amongst so many heresies, would only mark this so expressly, was the admiration of the fathers, and what they endeavoured to account for, in the best way they could in their age. But time, the faithful interpreter of prophecies, has discovered to us the deep cause; nor shall we wonder any more that the Holy Ghost was so particularly careful to forewarn us against this sect, after having seen it was this that infected Christianity the longest and the most dangerously; the longest, through so many ages as we have seen the world infected by it; and the most dangerously, not making a glaring breach from the church like the rest, but lurking, as much as was possible, within her precincts, and insinuating herself under the appearances of the same faith, the same worship, and even an astonishing shew of piety. For this reason St. Paul*, the apostle, so expressly points out its hypocrisy. Never has the spirit of lying, remarked by this apostle, been so justly charged on any sect, since besides its teaching, like the rest, a false doctrine, it exceeded all others in dissembling its belief. We have observed, that these wretches allowed every thing you pleased; they made nothing of lying in the most material points; they stuck not at perjury to conceal their tenets; their readiness in betraying their consciences shewed in them a certain insensibility which St. Paul admirably well expresses by the caustic † which renders the flesh insensible by mortifying it, as the learned Theodoret ‡ hath observed on this place; nor do I think ever prophecy could have been verified by more sensible characters than this has been.

---

* Ante, 1 Tim. † Ante. ‡ Comm. in hunc locum.

204.—*Sequel of the reasons why the Holy Ghost has pointed out this heresy more than the rest.*

No longer are we to wonder why the Holy Ghost would have the prediction of this heresy to be so particular and distinct. It was more than all other heresies the error "of the latter times," as it is called by St. Paul*, whether we understand by the latter times, according to the scripture style, all the times of the new law; or understand by that period of ages when Satan was to be loosed anew†. So long since as the second and third century, the church beheld the rise of Cerdon, of Marcion, of Manes, those enemies to the Creator‡. The seeds of this doctrine are every where to be met with; you find them in Tatian, who condemned wine and marriage; and in his Concordance of the Bible had erased all the texts that expressed Jesus Christ's genealogy from the blood of David. A hundred other infamous sects had attacked the God of the Jews even before Manes and Marcion; and we learn from Theodoret, that this last did but give another turn to the impieties of Simon the magician. Thus did this heresy commence from the very beginning of Christianity: it was the true "mystery of iniquity§ which fell to work in St. Paul's time; but the Holy Ghost, who foresaw this pestilence was one day to rage in a more glaring manner, made it be foretold by this apostle with an astonishing evidence and distinctness. Marcion and Manes have set this mystery of iniquity in a more manifest light; the abominable sect has continued its pestilent succession ever since that time. This we have seen, and never did heresy disturb the church for a longer date, nor spread its branches to a greater distance. But after that, by the eminent doctrine of St. Austin, by St. Leo's and St. Galasius's great care and diligence, it was extinguished every where in the West, and even in Rome, where it had strove to establish itself; then was seen to arrive the fatal term of Satan's being loosed "out of his prison||." A thousand years after that this strong armed had been bound by Jesus Christ at his coming into the world, the spirit of error grew up more than ever; the remains of Manicheism, too well sheltered in the East, broke in upon the Latin church. What hinders our looking on those miserable times as one of the periods of Satan's being loosed, without prejudice to the other more hidden meanings¶? If

---

* 1 Tim. iv. † Rev. xx. 3, 7.

‡ Epip. hær. xlvi. Theod. i. hær. fab. 20. Ibid. v. c. 24. § 2 Thess. ii. 7.

|| Rev. xx. 2, 3, 7. Matt. xii. 29. Luke xi. 21, 22.

¶ Rev. xx. 7, 8. Boch. Phal. lib. iii. 13.

Gog and Magog only be wanting to fulfil this prophecy, we shall find in Armenia, near Samosata, the province named Gogarene, where the Paulicians dwelt, and Magog amongst the Scythians, from whence the Bulgarians took their rise. Thence came those numberless enemies of "the beloved city*," who first assaulted Italy. The contagion flew, in an instant, to the extremity of the north: a spark raises a great combustion; the flame almost spreads over the whole face of the universe. In all parts of it is discovered this lurking poison; together with Manicheism, Arianism, with all kind of heresies, shoot up again under unheard of and uncouth names. Scarce could it be compassed to quench this fire in the space of three or four hundred years, and even some of its remains might be seen in the fifteenth century.

205.—*How the Vaudois came from the Albigensian Manicheans.*

Nor did the evil cease, when nothing seemed left of it but its ashes. Satan had supplied the impious sect wherewith to renew the conflagration, in a manner more dangerous than ever. Church-discipline was relaxed over all the earth; the disorders and abuses, carried even to the foot of the altar, made the good to sigh, humbled them, urged them on to improve still more in their virtuous courses; but wrought a far different effect on haughty minds. The Roman Church, the mother and bond of churches, became the object of hatred to all indocile tempers; envenomed satires spirit up the world against the clergy; the Manichean hypocrite trumpets them over the whole universe, and gives the name of Antichrist to the Church of Rome, for then was that notion broached in the sink of Manicheism, and amidst the precursors of Antichrist himself. These impious men imagine they appear more holy, when they say, holiness is essentially requisite to the administration of the Sacraments. The ignorant Vaudois swallow down this poison. No longer will they receive the sacraments from odious and defamed ministers; "the net is broken †" on all sides, and schisms multiply. Satan no longer stands in need of Manicheism; hatred against the church is wide diffused; the viperous sect has left a brood like to itself, and a too fruitful principle of schism. No matter, though these heretics have not the same doctrine, they are swayed by hatred and bitterness, and banded against the church; this is enough. The Vaudois believe not like the Albigenses, but like the Albigenses they hate the church, and proclaim themselves the only saints, the only ministers of the sacraments. Wickliff believes not like the Vaudois, but Wickliff proclaims, like the Vaudois, that the Pope and his whole clergy have forfeited all authority by their loose behaviour. John Huss does not believe like Wickliff, though he admires him; what he admires in him chiefly, and almost only follows in him is, that crimes annul authority. These despicable Bohemians, as we have seen, succeeded to this spirit, which they particularly made appear, when, amounting to no more than a handful of illiterate men, they presumed to rebaptize the whole world.

---

* Rev. xx. 7, 8.

† Luke v. 6.

206.—*How Luther and Calvin sprung from the Albigenses and Vaudois.*

But a still greater apostacy was hatching by means of these sects. The world teeming with animosity, brings forth Luther and Calvin, who canton Christendom. The superstructure is different, but the foundation is the same; it is still hatred against the clergy and the Church of Rome, and no man of sincerity can deny that this was the visible cause of their surprising progress. A reformation was necessary—who denies it? but it was still more necessary to refrain from schism. Were those that promoted this schism by their preaching any better than their neighbours? They acted as if they were; this was enough to delude and " spread like a canker," according to St. Paul's expression*. The world was desirous of condemning and rejecting their leaders; this is called Reformation. A specious name dazzles the people, and, to stir up hatred, calumny is not spared: thus is our doctrine blackened; men hate it before they know it.

207.—*The Protestant Churches seek in vain a succession of Persons in the preceding Sects.*

With new doctrines, new bodies of churches are erected. The Lutherans and Calvinists make the two greatest; but they cannot find in the whole earth so much as one church that believes like them, nor whence they can derive an ordinary and lawful mission. The Vaudois and Albigenses, alleged by some, are not to their purpose. We have but just shewn them to be mere laymen, as much at a loss to make out their own mission and title, as those that seek their aid. We know the Toulousian heretics were never able to delude so much as one priest.

---

* 2 Tim. ii. 17.

The preachers of the Vaudois were trading or mechanic men, nay women. The Bohemians had no better an original, as is already proved; and when Protestants name us all these sects, they name not their fathers, but accomplices.

208.—*Much less do they find in them a succession of Doctrine.*

But, perchance, though they do not find in these sects a succession of persons, they will find in them a succession of doctrines. Much less: in certain respects like to the Hussites; in others, like the Vaudois; in some like the Albigenses and the other sectaries; in other articles they are quite contrary to them; in this manner, without lighting upon any thing that is uniform, and laying hold here and there of what seems to suit them; without succession, without unity, without true predecessors, they climb to what height they can. They are not the first to reject the honour due to Saints, nor the oblations for the dead: they find, before their days, bodies of churches of this same belief in these two points. The Bohemians embraced them, but we have seen these Bohemians seek in vain for associates through the whole earth. Howsoever, here is a church at least before Luther; this is something to such as have nothing. But, after all, this church before Luther is but fifty years before him; they must strive to advance higher; they will find the Vaudois, and, a little more distant, the Manicheans of Toulouse. They will find, in the fourth age, the Manicheans of Africa opposed to the worship of Saints. One only, Vigilantius, follows them in this particular point, but higher than this no certain author can be found; yet thereon depends the stress of the question. They may go a little further as to oblations for the dead. The priest Aerius will appear, but alone, and without followers; an Arian into the bargain. This is all can be found that is positive; whatever is built besides this, will be built manifestly in the air. But let us see what they will discover as to the Real Presence, and remember the question is concerning positive and certain facts. Carlostadius is not the first who maintained that the bread was not made the body; Berengarius had said as much four hundred years before him, in the eleventh century. Yet neither was Berengarius the first; these Manicheans of Orleans had just said the same, and the world was still full of the rumour of their evil doctrine, when this scantling of it was picked up by Berengarius. Beyond this, I find many pretensions and actions lodged against us concerning this subject, but no averred and positive facts.

209.—*What is the succession of Heretics.*

Now the Socinians have a more manifest succession; catching up a word here and another there, they will name declared enemies of Jesus Christ's divinity in all ages, and at the top of them will find Cerinthus next to the Apostles. Notwithstanding their discovering something concordant among so many, in other respects, discording witnesses, they will be never the better founded, since, when all is said, Succession and Uniformity are wanting to them. To take the thing thus, namely, should each of them, in patching up their several churches, collect here and there without bond of union, all that could be found conformable to their sentiments; there is no difficulty, as might have been observed, to trace the extraction of every sect seen at this day, or ever to be seen, even up to Simon the Magician, and to that "mystery of iniquity*," which began in the time of St. Paul.

---

* 2 Thess. ii. 7.

BOOK XII.

From the Year 1571 to 1579, and from 1603 till the Year 1615.

A brief Summary.—The Reformed Churches disturbed about the word Substance even in France.—It is maintained as grounded on the word of God in one Synod, and in another brought to nothing in favour of the Swiss, who were angry with the decision.—One Faith for France, and another for Switzerland.—Assembly of Frankfort, and a project of a new Confession of Faith for the whole second party of Protestants—What was to be suppressed there in favour of the Lutherans.—Detestation of the Real Presence established and suppressed at the same time.—Piscator's affair, and the doctrinal decision of four National Synods reduced to nothing.—Principles of the Calvinists, and demonstrations drawn from them in our behalf.—Du Moulin's propositions received at the Synod of Ay.—Nothing solid or serious in the Reformation.

1.—*Many pretended Reformed Churches of France are for changing the article of the Supper, in their Confession of Faith.*—1581.

The union of Sendomir had not its effect, except in Poland. In Switzerland, the Zuinglians continued steadfast to reject equivocations. The French began already to join in their sentiments. Many maintained openly, that it was requisite to discard the word Substance, and change the thirty-sixth article of the Confession of Faith presented to Charles IX., wherein the Supper was explained. It was not particular men that made this dangerous proposal, but whole churches, even the chief churches, those of the Isle of France and Brie, that of Paris, that of Meaux, where the exercise of Calvinism commenced, and others neighbouring to them. These churches were for changing so considerable an article of their Confession of Faith, which they had published but ten years before as containing nothing but the pure word of God; this must have too much discredited the new party. The Synod of Rochelle, wherein Beza presided, resolved to condemn these reformers of the Reformation in 1571.

2.—*The National Synod condemns them.—This Synod's decision full of perplexities.*

The case required a clear and distinct sentence. The contest being on foot, and the parties present, there needed no more than to decide in few words; but brevity is the fruit of clear conceptions only. Behold, therefore, word for word what was concluded, and I ask only to be allowed to divide the decree into three parts, and to recite them severally.

They begin by rejecting what is evil, and their condemnations fall justly enough. To fix upon any thing will be the grand difficulty; but let us read. "Concerning the thirty-sixth article of the Confession of Faith, the deputies of the Isle of France represented, that it would be requisite to explain this article, insomuch as it speaks of the participation of the substance of Jesus Christ. After a conference of some length, the Synod, approving the thirty-sixth article, rejects the opinion of those who refuse to receive the word Substance, by which word is not understood any confusion, commixtion, or conjunction whatever after a carnal manner, or otherwise natural, but a true conjunction, very intimate, and in a spiritual way, whereby Jesus Christ himself is so made ours, and we his, that there is no conjunction of body, whether natural or artificial, so close; the which nevertheless does not tend to this end, that of his substance and person joined to our substances and persons, there should be compounded some third person and substance, but only to this, that his virtue and all in him requisite to our salvation, be by this means the more strictly given and communicated to us, dissenting from those who say, we join ourselves to all his merits and gifts, and with his holy Spirit only, without he himself being ours." Here is abundance of words, and nothing said. It is no commixtion, either carnal or natural: who knows not that? It has nothing in common with the vulgar mixtures; its end is divine; the manner of it is entirely celestial, and in this sense, spiritual; who questions it? But has any man ever dreamt, that of the substance of Jesus Christ united to ours, a third person was made a third substance? So much time ought not to be lost in rejecting such chimeras as never entered into any man's head.

3.—*Vain efforts of the Synod to find the substance of the Body and Blood in the Doctrine of the pretended reformed Churches.*

It is something to reject those who pretend we partake in nothing but the merits of Jesus Christ, in his gifts, and in his spirit, without his giving himself to us: it was only requisite they should add, that he gives himself to us in the proper and natural substance of his flesh and blood, for this was the point in hand, and the thing to be explained. Catholics do this very clearly, for they say, Jesus Christ in pronouncing "This is my body, the same that was given for you: This is my blood, the same that was shed for you*," designs, not the figure of it, but the substance, which, in saying "Take," he renders wholly ours, there being nothing more ours than that which is given us in this manner. This speaks; this is intelligible. Instead of delivering themselves thus clearly and distinctly, we shall see our ministers lose themselves in rambling from the point, heap texts on texts without concluding anything. Let us return to where we left off; here is what presents itself: "Not consenting," proceed they, "with those who say, we join ourselves to his merits and his gifts and his spirit only, yea, rather marvelling with the Apostle (Ephes. v.) at this secret, supernatural and incomprehensible to our reason, we believe that we are made partakers of the body given for us and the blood shed for us; that we be flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, and receive him together with all his gifts with him by faith engendered in us by the incomprehensible influence and power of this holy spirit; thus understanding that which is said, 'whoso eateth the flesh and drinketh the blood hath life everlasting.' Item, Christ is the vine and we the branches, and that he maketh us abide in him to the end we may bring forth fruit, and that we be members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." They are certainly afraid of being understood, or rather do not understand themselves: thus clogging their meaning with so many useless words, so many intricate phrases, such a confused jumble of crowded texts. For after all, what they have to shew is, how much those are in the wrong who, refusing to acknowledge, in the Eucharist, any other communication than that of the merits and spirit of Jesus Christ, discard from this mystery "The proper substance of his body and blood." Now this is what in no way appears in any of these numerous texts. These texts conclude, only that we receive something flowing from Jesus Christ in order to enliven us, as members receive from the Head the spirit which animates them; but do not at all conclude for our receiving the proper substance of his body and blood. None of these texts, except one only, namely, that of St. John vi., relate at all to the Eucharist; neither does that of St. John vi., if we believe the Calvinists, relate to it. And if this text, well understood, shews indeed in the Eucharist the proper substance of Jesus Christ's flesh and blood, yet it does not shew it in the manner it is here employed by the ministers, since the upshot of their discourse concludes at length in this, that "We receive Jesus Christ together with all his gifts with him by faith engendered in us." Now "Jesus Christ by faith engendered in us," is nothing less than Jesus Christ united to us in the proper and true substance of his flesh and blood; the first of these being no more than moral wrought by pious affections of the mind; and the second, being physical, is real and immediate of body to body, and of substance to substance: thus does this great synod expound nothing less than what it proposes to expound.

---

* Mat. xxvi. 26, 28. Luke xxii. 19, 20. 1 Cor. xi. 24.

4.—*Error of the Synod which seeks the Mystery of the Eucharist without producing the Institution.*

I observe in this decree, that the Calvinists having undertaken to explain the mystery of the Eucharist, and in this mystery the proper substance of Jesus Christ's body and blood, which it is grounded on, allege to us far different things from the words of the institution, "This is my body, This is my blood;" for they are very sensible, should they say, these words import the proper substance of the body and blood, that this would be making it clearly appear, that our Lord's design was to express the body and blood, not in figure, nor even in virtue, but in effect, in truth, and in substance. Thus this substance must have been not only by faith, in the minds and thoughts of the faithful, but in effect, and in truth, under the sacramental species, where Jesus Christ denotes it, and thereby, even in our bodies, into which we are ordered to receive it, to the end that we might, in every way, enjoy our Saviour and participate of our victim.

5.—*The Synod's reason for establishing the Substance.—They conclude the other Opinion to be contrary to God's word.*

Now, whereas the decree had not cited any one text that concluded for the proper substance, the thing in question, but rather had excluded it by shewing Jesus Christ united by faith only; they come back at length to the substance by the following words: "And in fact, as we derive our death from the first Adam, inasmuch as we partake of his substance; so it is requisite we should partake truly of the second Adam, Christ Jesus, that we may derive our life from him. Wherefore all pastors, and in general, all the faithful shall be exhorted to give no way, in any kind, to opinions contrary to the above doctrine, which is grounded *expressly on the word of God*."

6.—*The Synod says more than it designed.*

The holy Fathers made use of this comparison of Adam to shew that Jesus Christ ought to be in us otherwise than by faith and affection, or morally; for it is not by affection and thought only, that Adam and parents are in their children; it is by the communication of the same blood, and the same substance; and therefore the union we have with our parents, and by their means with Adam, from whom we are all descended, is not only moral, but physical and substantial. The Fathers have thence concluded, that the new Adam ought to be in us after a manner equally physical and substantial, to the end that we might derive immortality from him, as from our first parent we derive mortality. Accordingly, it is what they have found, and much more abundantly, in the Eucharist than in ordinary generation, for that it is not a portion of the blood and substance, but the whole substance and the whole blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which is therein communicated to us. To say now with the ministers, that this communication is wrought barely by faith, is not only to weaken the comparison, but also to annihilate the mystery, and deprive it of its substance; and whereas it is more abundantly in Jesus Christ than in Adam, it is making it to be much less in him, or rather not at all.

7.—*A point of Doctrine was in Question among them.*

Thus do our doctors confound themselves, and the more pains they take to speak their minds, the more do they obscure the subject. Nevertheless, through all these mists, you discern plainly, that among the defenders of the figurative sense there was in reality an opinion which admitted nothing in the Eucharist but the gifts and merits of Jesus Christ, or at most, nothing but his spirit, not the proper substance of his flesh and blood; but that this opinion was expressly contrary to the word of God, and not to have any admittance amongst the faithful.

8.—*The Swiss believe themselves condemned by this Decision.*

It is no hard matter to guess who were the defenders of this opinion: it was the Swiss, the disciples of Zuinglius; and such of the French as approving their sentiment would fain reform this article. And this was the reason that the Swiss were presently heard to complain, thinking they beheld their own condemnation in the Synod of Rochelle, and the fraternity broken; since, notwithstanding the soft turn given to the decree, their doctrine was condemned in the main as contrary to the word of God, with express exhortation to allow it no shelter among the pastors or the faithful.

9.—*The Synod answers them by Beza, that this Doctrine only regards France.—The Lutherans as well as Catholics detested as Defenders of a monstrous Opinion.*

Under this persuasion they wrote to Beza, and the answer returned them was surprising. Beza was ordered to acquaint them, that the decree of the synod of Rochelle did not regard them, but only certain Frenchmen; so that there was a confession of faith for France, and another for Switzerland, as if faith varied according to the climate, and it were not equally true, that in Christ Jesus there is neither Swiss nor Frenchman, as it is true, according to St. Paul, that there is neither Scythian nor Greek. To this Beza added, in order to claim the Swiss, that the churches of France detested the substantial and carnal presence, together with the monsters of transubstantiation and consubstantiation *. Here, then, by and by, we have the Lutherans as badly treated as the Catholics, and their doctrine accounted no less monstrous; but this only in writing to the Swiss: we have seen how far they are able to soften matters when they write to the Lutherans, and how tender they are then of consubstantiation.

10.—*The Swiss, not satisfied with Beza's Answer, still hold themselves for condemned.*

The Swiss would not be gulled with these subtilties of the synod of Rochelle, but were very sensible that they themselves were attacked under the name of these Frenchmen. Bullinger, minister of Zurich, who was ordered to answer Beza, made no difficulty of telling him they were in fact the people condemned:† "You condemn," answered he, "those who reject the word 'proper substance;' and who is ignorant that we are of this number?" What Beza had added, against the carnal and substantial presence, did not remove the difficulty; Bullinger knew full well, that the Catholics no less than the Lutherans complained that a carnal presence was laid to their charge, which they did not dream of; and besides, he could not comprehend the meaning of receiving in substance what was not substantially present. Thus unable to conceive the refinements of Beza, or a substance united without being present, he answered him, "that they ought to speak plainly in matters of faith, lest they should reduce the simple to such straits as no longer to know what to believe;" whence he concluded that it was necessary to mitigate the decree, and this was the only means he proposed for a reconcilement.

---

* Colos. iii. 11. Hosp. 1571. f. 344. † Hosp. Ibid.

11.—*They were at last forced to change the Decree, and reduce the Substance to nothing at all.*—1572.

They were forced to stoop to these terms, and the year following, in the synod of Nismes, substance was brought to so small a matter, that they might as well have quite suppressed it. Whereas at the synod of Rochelle, the debate was about putting a stop to an opinion contrary to that which was grounded expressly on the word of God, they endeavour now to insinuate that the question was only about a word. They raze out of the decree of Rochelle these words which contained its main force and purpose: viz. "The synod rejects the opinion of those who refuse to receive the word substance." They declare they will do no prejudice to strangers; and such is their complaisance for them, that these great words, "the proper substance of Jesus Christ's body and blood," so much affected by Calvin, so strenuously maintained by his disciples, so carefully retained at the synod of Rochelle, and at last brought to nothing by our reformed, no longer appear in their confession of faith, but as a monument of the impression of the reality and substance, which the words of Jesus Christ had naturally made in the minds of their forefathers, and even of Calvin himself.

12.—*Reflection on this weakening of the first Doctrine.*

And yet if they will but reflect on these relaxations of their first doctrine, they may observe therein in what manner the spirit of seduction has deluded them. Their fathers would not easily have deprived themselves of the substance of Jesus Christ's body and blood. Accustomed in the Church to this sweet presence of the body and blood of their Saviour, the pledge of an immense love, they would not willingly have been brought down to shadows and figures, nor to a simple virtue flowing from his body and blood. Calvin had promised them something more. They had suffered themselves to be attracted by a notion of reality and substance continually inculcated in his books, in his sermons, in his commentaries, in his confessions of faith, in his catechisms: a false notion, I confess, they being there in words only, and not in fact; but yet they were charmed with the fine idea, and believing they lost nothing of what was possessed by them in the church, they did not fear to leave it. Now that Zuinglius has gained the ascendant by the consent of their synods, and Calvin's big words stand evidently void of force and destitute of all sense, why do not they return from their error, and seek, in the church, that real possession with which they had been flattered?

13.—*The different Confessions of Faith a mark of the disunion of the Party.*

The Swiss Zuinglians were appeased by the explanation of the synod of Nismes: but the ground of division still subsisted. So many confessions of faith were a too convincing token of it to be dissembled. Meanwhile the French, the Swiss, the English, and the Poles, had their separate ones, which all of them kept to, without borrowing from their neighbours, and their union seemed nearer allied to policy than true concord.

14.—*The Assembly of Frankfort, where endeavours are used to bring the defenders of the figurative sense to agree in one common Confession.*—1572.

They had often sought remedies for this inconvenience, but in vain. In 1577, an assembly was held at Frankfort, where the ambassadors of Queen Elizabeth assembled with the deputies of France, of Poland, of Hungary, and of the low countries*. The Count Palatine, John Casimir, who the year before had brought into France so great a succour to our reformed, procured this assembly. The whole party that defended the figurative sense, whereof this prince was one, was there assembled, except the Swiss and Bohemians. But these last had sent their declaration, submitting themselves thereby to what should be resolved: and as for the Swiss, the Palatine caused it to be declared by his ambassador that he held himself assured of them*. The intent of this convention, as appears by the palatine-deputy's harangue at his opening of it, was to draw up, by the unanimous consent of all the other deputies, one common confession of faith for these churches; and the reason that induced the Palatine to make this proposal was, because the Lutherans of Germany, after making the famous book of Concord so often mentioned, were to hold an assembly at Magdeburg, there to pronounce with one accord the approbation of this book, and at the same time the condemnation of all those who should refuse to subscribe it; so as, being declared Heretics, they might be excluded from toleration granted by the empire in matters of religion. By this means, all the defenders of the figurative sense were to be banished, and the monster of ubiquity, maintained in this book, to be established. It was the interest of these churches, which were to be condemned, to appear at that time numerous, powerful, and united. They were cried down as having each one their particular confession of faith, and the Lutherans, united under the common name of the Confession of Augsburg, easily resolved on the proscription of a party, which its disunion made contemptible.

---

* Act. auth. Blon. p. 59.

15.—*A design of comprehending the Lutherans in this common Confession of Faith.*

This their great grievance was coloured over nevertheless, in the best way possible, with specious words; and the Palatine deputy declared that all these Confessions of Faith, conformable in doctrine, differed in method only, and the way of speaking. But he well knew the contrary, nor were the differences but too real for these Churches. Be that as it will, it was their interest, in order to put a stop to the proceedings of the Lutherans, to shew them their union by a confession of faith as well received among them all, as was that of Augsburg among the Lutherans. But they had yet a more general design: for in making this new confession of faith common to the defenders of the figurative sense, their intent was to pitch on such expressions as the Lutherans, defenders of the literal sense, might agree too, and so by this means make one body of the whole party called Reformed. The deputies had no better means than this of preventing the condemnation threatened them from the Lutheran party. Wherefore, the decree they made concerning this common Confession of Faith had this turn given it *. "That it ought to be made, and made clear, full, and solid, with a clear and brief refutation of all the heresies of these times; yet, with such a temper of style, as rather to attract than alienate those that adhere purely to the Confession of Augsburg, as much as truth could allow."

---

* Act. auth. Blon. p. 60.

16.—*Qualities of this new Confession of Faith.—Deputies named to draw it up.*

To make this Confession of Faith clear, to make it full, to make it solid, with a clear and brief confutation of all the heresies of those times, was a grand undertaking; fine words, but the thing exceeding difficult, not to say impossible, amongst people of such different persuasions: above all, not to exasperate any further the Lutherans, those zealous defenders of the literal sense, it was necessary to pass lightly over the Real Presence, and the other articles so often mentioned. Divines were named, who had a thorough knowledge of the Church's grievances, to wit, of the divisions in the Reformation, and of her Confessions of Faith which kept them asunder. Rodulph Gaultier, and Theodore Beza, ministers, one of Zurich and the other of Geneva, were to put the finishing stroke to the work which was afterwards to be dispatched to all the Churches in order to be read, examined, corrected, and augmented as judged proper.

17.—*Letter written to the Lutherans by the assembly of Frankfort.*

To prepare a work of so great a nicety, and hinder the condemnation which the Lutherans were hatching, it was concluded to write, in the name of the whole assembly, a letter capable of mollifying them. Wherefore they were acquainted †, that this assembly was called together from sundry parts of the Christian world, to oppose the Pope's attempts, after informations received that he was uniting the most potent princes of Christendom against them, namely, the Emperor, the King of France, and the King of Spain; but what had most afflicted them was, that certain princes of Germany, who say they invoke the same God with us, as if the Catholics had another, and detest with us the tyranny of the Roman Antichrist, were preparing to condemn the doctrine of their Churches; and so, amidst the misfortunes that distressed them, they saw themselves attacked by those, in whose virtue and wisdom they had reposed their chief trust.

---

* Act. auth. Blon. p. 62.

† Ibid. p. 63.

18.—*The Assembly minces the difficulty of the Eucharist.*

Then they represented to those of the Confession of Augsburg, that the Pope, whilst he ruined the rest of the Churches, would not spare them. For how, proceed they, should he hate those less who first gave him the mortal stab, namely, the Lutherans, whom, by this means, they place at the head of the whole party? They propose a free council in order to unite amongst themselves, and oppose the common enemy. Lastly, after complaining they were going to be condemned without a hearing, they say, the controversy that divides them most from those of the Confession of Augsburg, *viz.* that of the Supper and Real Presence, has not so much difficulty as is imagined, and it is an injury done them to accuse them of rejecting the Confession of Augsburg. But they add, it stood in need of explanation in some places, and even that Luther and Melancthon had made some corrections in it; by which they evidently mean those different editions, wherein were made the above-seen changes in the lifetime of Luther and Melancthon.

19.—*The consent of the Synod of Sainte-Foy to the new Confession of Faith.*—1578.

The year following, the Calvinists of France held their national Synod at Sainte-Foy, where they gave power to change the Confession of Faith, which they had so solemnly presented to our Kings, and which they boasted to maintain to the last drop of their blood. The decree of this Synod is worth our notice: it imports, "that after seeing the instructions of the assembly held at Frankfort by the means of Duke John Casimir, they enter into the design of uniting in one holy band of pure doctrine all the *reformed* Churches of *Christendom*, whereof certain Protestant Divines were for condemning the soundest and the greatest part: and approve the project of making and drawing up a formulary of a Confession of Faith common to all the Churches, as also the invitation expressly made to the Churches of this kingdom, to send to the place appointed men well approved and authorized with ample procuration, in order to treat, agree, decide on all the points of doctrine and other things relating to the union, repose, and preservation of the Church, and God's pure service." For the execution of this project, they name four deputies to draw up this common

Confession of Faith, but with much more ample powers than had been demanded for them in the assembly of Frankfort *. For, whereas this assembly, unable to believe the Churches could agree in one Confession of Faith without seeing it, had ordered, that after its being seen by certain ministers and polished for their examination and correction, this Synod, condescending beyond all that could be imagined, not only expressly charges these four deputies to be present at the place and time appointed, with ample procurations as well from the ministers, as in particular from the Viscount of Turenne; but also adds thereto, " that in case even there were no means of examining this Confession of Faith throughout all the provinces, it was left to their prudence and sound judgment to agree and conclude all the points that shall come under deliberation, whether in regard of doctrine, or any other thing concerning the welfare, union, and repose of all the Churches."

20.—*Faith trusted in the hands of four Ministers, and of the Viscount of Turenne.*

Here have you then manifestly, by the authority of a whole national Synod, the faith of our pretended churches of France left to the disposal of four ministers and of the Viscount of Turenne, with power to determine therein as they pleased, and those who will not allow, that we may refer to the judgment of the whole Church the least points of faith, refer the whole of theirs to that of their deputies.

21.—*Why Mr. de Turenne was put in this deputation concerning Doctrine.*

One may wonder perchance to see Mr. de Turenne named amongst these doctors: but you must understand that this welfare, union, and repose of all the churches, for the sake of which this deputation was made, meant much more than appeared at first sight. Forasmuch as the Duke John Casimir, and Henry de la Tour, Viscount of Turenne, joint deputies with these ministers, had thoughts of settling this repose by other means than by arguments and Confessions of Faith; which, however, necessarily made part of the negotiation, experience having shewn that these new reformed Churches could not be united in a league as they ought, without first agreeing in point of doctrine. All France was flaming with civil wars; and the Viscount de Turenne, then but young, yet full of wit and valour, whom the disaster of the times had drawn into the party but two or three years before, had immediately raised to himself in it so great an authority (not so much by his illustrious blood which allied him to the greatest families of the kingdom, as his great capacity and courage), that he was already lord-lieutenant to the King of Navarre, afterwards Henry IV. A man of such genius entered easily into the design of reuniting all the Protestants: but God did not suffer him to accomplish it. The Lutherans were found intractable, and the Confessions of Faith, notwithstanding the resolution unanimously taken of changing them all, subsisted as containing the pure word of God, which it is neither lawful to add to, nor take from.

---

* Hist. de Pas. de Franc. Act. auth. Blon. p. 63. Syn. de Sainte-Foy. Ibid. pp. 5, 6.

22.—*Letter, wherein the Calvinists own Luther and Melancthon for their Fathers.*

We see that, in the year following, namely 1579, a union was still hoped for, since the Calvinists of the Low Countries wrote conjointly to the Lutherans, authors of the Book of Concord, to Kemnitius, Chythræus, James Andrew, and the rest of the violent defenders of Ubiquity, whom they failed not to call, not only their brethren, but their own flesh (so intimate was their union, notwithstanding their so considerable divisions,) inviting them "to take moderate counsels, to enter into methods of union, in order whereto the Synod of France (that of Sainte-Foy) had named deputies, and this," say they, "after the example of our holy fathers, Luther, Zuinglius, Capito, Bucer, Melancthon, Bullinger, Calvin,"[1] whose unanimity was such as you have seen. These, then, are the common fathers of the Sacramentarians and Lutherans; these are the men in whose harmony and moderate counsels the Calvinists glory!

23.—*The project of a Common Confession continued to our days, and always to no purpose.*

All these endeavours towards a union proved abortive, and the defenders of the figurative sense were so far from being able to agree with the Lutherans, defenders of the literal sense, in one common Confession of Faith, that they could not even agree among themselves*. The proposal was frequently renewed, and even near to our days in 1614, at the Synod of

---

* Act. Auth. Blon. p. 72.

Tonins, which, in 1615, was backed by the expedients proposed by the famous Peter du Moulin. But though for this he received the thanks of the Synod of the Isle of France, held the same year at the borough of Ay, in Champagne ; and notwithstanding the known credit he had, not only in France, among his own brethren, but also in England and over the whole party, all proved to no purpose. The churches, which defend the figurative sense, confessed the mighty evil of their disunion, but withal confessed it was beyond remedy; and this common Confession of Faith, so earnestly desired and endeavoured at, is become a Platonic idea.

24.—*Vain shifts of the Ministers.*

This history would require that I should relate the answers returned by the ministers, with regard to this decree of Sainte-Foy, after it became public, and was urged against them by the Catholics. But all of them, by the above account of the fact, fall of themselves. Some said, a mutual toleration was the only thing in question ; but it is plain enough, a common Confession of Faith was not necessary for that end, since the effect of this toleration is, not to make one common faith, but to bear mutually with one another's faith. Others, in excuse for the great power of deciding on doctrine lodged in the hands of four deputies, answered, this was because it was known "near the matter[*]" what they could agree in; this "near the matter" is admirable. Doubtless men are not over nice in questions of faith when satisfied with knowing "near the matter" what they are to say; and little also do they know what to stick to, when, for want of such knowledge, they give their deputies so unlimited a power of concluding whatsoever they shall think fitting. The minister Claude [†] answered, that they knew precisely what they were to say; and should the deputies have gone beyond it, they would have justly been disowned as men that had gone beyond their commission. But this answer, allowing it so, does not satisfy the chief difficulty, consisting in this, that to please the Lutherans, they must have given up to them all that tended to exclude, as well the Real Presence as the other points contested with them ; that is to say, they must evidently have changed, in such considerable articles, a Confession of Faith expressly affirmed by them to be contained in the word of God.

---

[*] Anon. ii. Rep. p. 365.

[†] Mr. Claude, dan la Nog. Conf. rep, a l'Expos. p. 149.

25.—*Difference betwixt what was designed to be done in favour of the Lutherans at Frankfort and Sainte-Foy, and what was done at Charenton.*

Care ought to be taken not to confound what was to be done then with what was done since, when the Lutherans were received into communion at the Synod of Charenton, in 1631. This last action shews only, that the Calvinists can bear with the Lutheran doctrine, as a doctrine not at all prejudicial to the *fundamentals* of faith. But it is certainly quite a different thing to tolerate, in the Lutheran's Confession of Faith, what you believe erroneous in it, and to suppress in your own what you believe to be a truth revealed of God, and expressly declared by his word. This is what they had resolved to do in the assembly of Frankfort and at the Synod of Sainte-Foy; this is what they would have executed, had it pleased the Lutherans; insomuch that it was only the fault of the defenders of the Real Presence that all which clashed with it was not erased out of the Sacramentarian Confessions of Faith. But the reason of this was, once change, and no end of changing; a Confession of Faith which changes the doctrine of ages past, shews thereby that itself may be changed likewise; nor must we wonder the Synod of Sainte-Foy thought they had power to correct in 1578 what the Synod of Paris had established in 1559.

26.—*Spirit of instability in Calvinism.*

All these means of agreement now mentioned, so far from diminishing the disunion of our Reformed, did but increase it. Here were men ignorant as yet what to stick to, whose first step, at setting out, was by a breach upon the whole Christian world. Here was a religion built on the sand, which had no stability even in her Confessions of Faith, although made with such nice care, and published with such pomp. Even the professors of it could not persuade themselves that they had not a right to innovate in so changeable a religion, and it was this produced the novelties of John Fischer, known under the name of Piscator, and those of Arminius.

27.—*Piscator's dispute.*

Piscator's affair will teach us many important matters, and I am the more desirous to relate it at full length, the less it is know by the generality of our reformed.

Piscator taught divinity in the academy of Herborne, a town in the earldom of Nassau, towards the end of the sixteenth century. Examining the doctrine of Imputed Justice, he says that the justice of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to us, is not that which he practised during the course of his life, but that which he underwent in bearing voluntarily the punishment of our sin on the cross; as much as to say, the death of our Lord being a sacrifice of an infinite value, whereby he paid and satisfied for us, it was also by this act alone that the Son of God was properly Saviour, without any necessity of joining to it any other acts, this being of itself sufficient; so that, if we are to be justified by imputation, it is by that of this act, in virtue whereof precisely we are acquitted in the sight of God, and whereby "the hand-writing of the sentence passed against us was defaced," as St. Paul speaks, "by the blood which pacifieth both heaven and earth*.

28.—*This doctrine detested by the National Synod of Gap.—First decision.*

This doctrine was detested by our Calvinists in the Synod of Gap, anno 1603†, as contrary to the eighteenth, twentieth, and twenty-second articles of the Confession of Faith, and it was resolved by them, "that a letter should be addressed to Mr. Piscator, and likewise to the university in which he taught."

It is certain these three articles decided nothing as to what concerned Piscator, and for this reason we find no more mention made of the twentieth and twenty-second articles. And as to the eighteenth, in which it was pretended the decision might be found, it said no more than that "we are justified by the obedience of Jesus Christ, which is allowed us," without specifying what obedience; so that Piscator found it no hard matter to defend himself in regard to the Confession of Faith. But since they will have it that he innovated in respect to the Confession of the pretended reformed of this kingdom, which had been subscribed by those of the Low Countries, I agree to it.

29.—*Second Condemnation of Piscator's Doctrine at the Synod of Rochelle.*

Piscator was written to by order of the synod, as resolved, and his answer, modest, but firm in his sentiment, was read at the Synod of Rochelle, in 1607. After reading it, this decree was made: "As to the letter of Dr. John Piscator, Professor in the Academy of Herborne, in answer to that of the Synod of Gap, rendering account of his doctrine which teaches justification to be by the sole obedience of Christ in his death and passion, imputed as justice to the faithful, and not by the obedience of his life; the assembly *not approving* the division of causes so conjoint, hath declared, that the whole obedience of Christ in his life and death is imputed to us for the entire remission of our sins, *as being no other than one and the same obedience.*"

---

* Col. ii. 14.

† Syn. de Gap. ch. de la Conf. de Foy.

30.—*Important observation, that the Doctrine of the Calvinists against Piscator resolves the difficulties they urge against us in regard of the sacrifice of the Eucharist.*

In consideration of these last words, I would willingly ask our Reformed, why, in order to merit for us the forgiveness of our sins, they require, not only the obedience of the death, but also that of the whole life of our Redeemer? Is it that the merit of Jesus Christ dying is not infinite, and not more than sufficient, for our salvation? This they will not say; they must, therefore, say, that what is required as necessary after an infinite merit, does neither destroy its infiniteness nor sufficiency; but at the same time it follows, that to consider Jesus Christ, as continuing his intercession by his presence not in heaven only, but also on our Altars in the sacrifice of the Eucharist, is destroying nothing of the infiniteness of the propitiation made on the cross; it is only, as speaks the Synod of Rochelle, not dividing things conjoined, and accounting all Jesus Christ did in his life, all he did in his death, and all he now does whether in heaven, where he presents himself for us to the Father, or on our Altars, where he is present in another way, as the continuation of one and the same intercession, and of one and the same obedience which he began in his life, consummated in his death, and never ceases to renew both in heaven and in the mysteries, thereby to apply them to us effectually and perpetually.

31.—*Third decision.—Formulary and Subscription ordained against Piscator in the Synod of Privas.*—1612.

The doctrine of Piscator had its partisans. Nothing was found against him in the eighteenth, twentieth, and twenty-second articles of the Confession of Faith. And, indeed, they abandoned the two last to fix on the eighteenth, which was no more to the purpose, as we have seen, than the others; and to drive the matter home against Piscator and his doctrine, they went so far, in the national Synod of Privas, as to oblige all the pastors to subscribe expressly against Piscator in these terms: "I underwritten N. in regard to the contents in the eighteenth article of the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches, regarding our justification, do declare and protest, that *I understand it according to the sense received in our church, approved by the national synods, and conformable to God's word;* which is, that our Lord Jesus Christ was subject to the moral and ceremonial law, not only for our good, but in our stead; and that all the obedience he rendered to the law is imputed to us, and that our justification does consist, not only in the remission of sins, but in the imputation of active justice; and *subjecting myself to the word of God,* I believe 'that the Son of man came not be ministered unto, but to minister,' and that he did minister to the purpose he came for: *promising never to depart from the doctrine received in our churches, and to subject myself to the ordinances of the national synods on this head.*"

32.—*The Scripture ill-quoted, and its whole Doctrine ill-understood.*

What it avails imputed justice, that "Jesus Christ came to minister, and not to be ministered unto;" and to what purpose this text is brought abruptly and without connexion into the midst of this decree, let him guess that can. Neither do I see what use the imputation of the ceremonial law is to us, which never was made for us; nor for what reason "Jesus Christ must have been subject to it, not only for our good, but in our stead." I well comprehend how Jesus Christ, having dispersed the shadows and figures of the law, has left us free from the servitude of the ceremonial laws, which were but shadows and figures; but that it was necessary for such intent that he himself should have been subject to them in our stead, the consequence would be pernicious, since it might be equally concluded he had also set us free from the moral law, by his fulfilling it. All this shews the little exactness of our Reformed, who were more intent on shewing erudition in a profusion of big empty words, than on speaking with accuracy in their decrees.

33.—*Fourth decision against Piscator in the Synod of Tonins.*—1614.

I am at a loss to know what could be the reason that Piscator's affair was had so very much to heart by our French Reformed, or why the Synod of Privas descended to the utmost precautions, by enjoining the above subscription. This, however, ought to have been decisive: a formulary of faith, ordered to be subscribed by all the pastors, should have explained the matter fully and distinctly. Nevertheless, after this subscription and all the precedent decrees, it was still necessary to make a new declaration at the Synod of Tonins in 1614. Four great decrees one after another, and in such different terms, concerning a particular article, and on so limited a subject, is very extraordinary; but in the new Reformation something is always found to be added or curtailed, and never is their faith explained so sincerely, nor with so full a sufficiency, as to make them adhere precisely to the first decisions.

34.—*The impiety of imputed justice as it is proposed by these Synods.*

To conclude this affair, I shall make a short reflection on the nature of the doctrine, and some reflections on the procedure.

As to the doctrine, I very well understand how the death of Jesus Christ, and the payment he made to the divine justice of the punishment we owed it, is imputed to us, as you impute to a debtor the payment made by the surety for his acquittance. But that the perfect justice fulfilled by our Lord in his life and death, and the absolute obedience he rendered to the law, should be imputed to us, or as they speak, allowed, in the same sense, that the payment of the surety is imputed to the debtor; is the same as to say, that he discharges us by his justice from the obligation of being good and virtuous, as by his punishment he discharges us from the obligation of undergoing that which our sins had merited.

35.—*Plainness and simplicity of the Catholic Doctrine opposed to the obscurities of the contrary.*

I understand, then, and very clearly, in another kind of manner, what it avails us to have a Saviour whose sanctity is infinite. For thereby I behold him alone worthy to obtain for us all the graces requisite to make us just. But that we should formally be made just, because Jesus Christ was just; and that his justice should be allowed us, as if he had fulfilled the law to our discharge, neither does the Scripture say it, nor can any man of good sense comprehend it.

By this means accounting as nothing our interior justice, and that which we practise through grace, they make us all in the main equally just, by reason that the justice of Jesus Christ, supposed by them the only one that renders us just, is infinite.

They likewise wrest from the elect of God that crown of justice, which the just Judge reserves for each one in particular, since they suppose all have the same justice which is infinite; or if at length they confess, this infinite justice is allowed us in different degrees, accordingly as we approach to it more or less by that particular justice we are vested with by grace, it is by extraordinary expressions, saying the same thing with the Catholics.

36.—*Reflection on the procedure—Scripture quoted therein only for form-sake.*

This is, in a few words, what I had to say on the doctrine itself. I shall be still more brief as to the procedure: it has nothing but what is weak in it, nothing grave nor serious. The act of most importance is the formulary of subscription enjoined at the Synod of Privas, but, from the very beginning, they do not so much as think of convicting Piscator from the Scriptures. The point to be proved was, "That the obedience of Jesus Christ, whereby he fulfilled the whole law in his life and death, is allowed us in order to make us just," which is called in the formulary of Privas, as before in that of Gap, the imputation of the active justice.

Now, all that could be found in four synods to prove this doctrine and the imputation of the active justice, by the Scripture, is, that "the Son of Man did not come to be ministered unto, but to minister," a text so little adapted to imputed justice, that there is no discovering even to what purpose it was cited.

But so it is with these new reformers, provided they name but the word of God with emphasis, and then fling out a text or two, however wide from the purpose, they think to have answered the profession they make of believing nought but Scripture in express terms. The people are dazzled with these big promises, and are not even sensible what a sway the authority of their ministers has over them, though when all is done it is by that their assent is determined.

37.—*How the Confession of Faith is quoted.*

As from the word of God nothing was proved against Piscator, so likewise their Confession of Faith was opposed in vain against him.

For we have seen them at Privas immediately forego the twentieth and twenty-second articles, which were produced at Gap. The eighteenth is only insisted on, and as it spoke nothing but what was general and indeterminate, theybe hotught themselves of thus remedying it in the Formulary: "I declare and protest that I understand the eighteenth article of our Confession of Faith according to the sense received in our churches, approved in our synods, and conformable to the word of God."

The word of God would have sufficed alone; but as that was in dispute, to finish it there was a necessity of coming back to the authority of things judged, and abiding by the article of the Confession of Faith, understanding it, not according to its precise terms, but according to the sense received in churches, and approved in the National Synods, which finally regulates the dispute by tradition, and shews us that the most assured means of understanding what is written, is to see in what manner it always had been understood.

This is what passed, as to the affair of Piscator, in four national synods. The last of them was that of Tonins, held in 1614, where, after the subscription commanded by the Synod of Privas, all seemed determined in the most serious manner imaginable; yet after all there was nothing in it, for the year following, to go no further, that is, in 1615, Du Moulin, the most renowned of all their ministers, openly made a jest of it, with the approbation of a whole synod. The history of the thing is this:—

38.—*They laugh at all these Decrees.—Nothing serious in the Reformation.—Du Moulin's remonstrance approved in the Synod of Ay.*—1615.

The party of the Reformation opposed to Lutheranism had always been disturbed that they could never contrive among themselves a common Confession, to unite all their members, as the Confession of Augsburg united all the Lutherans. So many different Confessions of Faith shewed a principle of division which weakened the party. They came back, therefore, once more to the project of a re-union. Du Moulin proposed the means in a writing sent to the Synod of the Isle of France. The whole drift of it was to dissemble the dogmata, which they could not agree in; and Du Moulin writes in express terms, that among the things it was requisite to dissemble in this new Confession of Faith, they ought to place Piscator's question regarding Justification *: a doctrine so much detested by four national synods, becomes indifferent all on a sudden in the opinion of this minister, and the Synod of the Isle of France, with the same hand with which it had but just subscribed Piscator's condemnation, nay, the pen, as I may say, still wet with the ink it had made this subscription with, thanks Mr. Du Moulin by express letters for this proposal*: such instability is there in the new Reformation, and so easily does she sacrifice the greatest matters to this common Confession which she never could attain.

---

* Act. Auth. Blond. Piece. vi. p. 72.

39.—*Du Moulin's words—Dissimulation, character of Heresy, owned in the Reformation.*

The words of Du Moulin are too remarkable not to be related. "There," says he†, viz., in this assembly to be held for this new Confession of Faith, "I am for no disputes about religion, for minds once heated will never be brought to yield, and each one at his return cries out victory; but I would have laid on the table the Confession of the churches of France, of England, of Scotland, of the Low Countries, of the Palatinate, of the Swiss, &c. That out of these Confessions we might strive to form *one common* one, wherein we should *dissemble* many things, without the knowledge of which one might be saved, *as is Piscator's question* regarding Justification, and many subtile opinions proposed *by Arminius* about Free-will, Predestination, and Perseverance of the Saints."

He adds, "as Satan had corrupted the church of Rome by her having too much, namely, by avarice and ambition, so he strives to corrupt the churches of the new reformation by knowing too much, to wit, by curiosity," which, in reality, is the temptation all heretics sink under, and the snare they are taken in; and concludes that, in the way of agreement, "they shall have gone the greatest part of the journey, if they can but prevail on themselves to be ignorant of many things, be contented with necessaries to salvation, and be easy in regard or others."

40.—*Reflection on these words of Du Moulin approved in the Synod of Ay.*

How to agree in this matter was the question, for if by such things, the knowledge of which is necessary to salvation, he understands those which every private man is obliged to know, under penalty of damnation, this common Confession of Faith is already made in the Creed of the Apostles, and in that of Nice. The union made on this foundation would reach much beyond the newly-reformed churches, nor could they hinder our being comprehended in it; but, "if by the knowledge of things necessary to salvation" he understands the full explanation of all the expressly revealed truths of God, who has revealed none the knowledge of which does not tend to secure the salvation of his faithful, there "to dissemble" what the synods have declared "expressly revealed of God," with "detestation" of the contrary errors, is laughing at the church, is holding her decrees for imposture even after signing them, is betraying both religion and conscience.

---

* Act. Auth. Blond. Piece. vi. p. 72.

† Ibid. n. 4.

41.—*Du Moulin's inconstancy.*

Now, when you shall perceive that this same Du Moulin, who makes so slight a matter, not of Piscator's propositions only, but also of the much more important ones of Arminius, was afterwards one of the most unmerciful censors of them, you will acknowledge, in his procedure, the perpetual inconstancy of the new Reformation, always suiting her dogmata to the occasion.

42.—*Great points to be suppressed; amongst others that which is contrary to the Real Presence.*

To conclude the account of this project of re-union then concerted, when this common Confession of the party opposed to the Lutherans should be finished, another was to be made also, but more wide and general, in which the Lutherans might be comprehended*. Du Moulin here sets forth all the ways of expressing themselves, so as "not to condemn the Real Presence, nor Ubiquity, nor the necessity of Baptism," nor the rest of the Lutheran tenets; and what he cannot save by equivocations or indeterminate expressions, he wraps up in silence, in the best way he can: he hopes to abolish by this means the appellation of Lutherans, of Calvinists, of Sacramentarians, and, by force of equivocating, to make no other name remain for Protestants than the common one of the Christian Church Reformed. The whole Synod of the Isle of France applauded this fine plan; and this union, thus completed, it would be time, proceeds this minister, to solicit the reconciliation of the Church of Rome—but he doubts as to their succeeding. And with good reason, for we have not one instance of her ever approving equivocations in matters of religion, or consenting to the suppression of articles she once believed revealed by God.

---

* Act. Auth. Blond. pp. 12, 13.

43.—*Importance of the disputes among the defenders of the figurative sense.*

But I do not allow to Du Moulin and the rest of the same party, that the differences in their Confessions of Faith are only in the method and expressions, or else in polity and ceremonies; or, if in matters of faith, in such only as had not yet passed into law or public ordinance: for we have seen, and shall see the contrary through the whole sequel of this history. And can they say, for example, that the doctrine of Episcopacy wherein the Church of England is so firm, and carries it to such a pitch as to receive no Calvinian ministers without reordaining them, is a matter only of expression, or, at most, of mere polity and ceremony? Is it nothing to look on a Church as utterly destitute of pastors lawfully ordained? It is true the Calvinists are even with them, as we are assured by one of their famous ministers in these words: "If any of ours should teach the distinction of bishops and priests, and that there is no true ministry without bishops, we could not suffer him in our Communion, that is to say, at least in our ministry*." The English Protestants therefore are excluded from it. Is this a difference of small importance? This same minister does not speak so of it, he being agreed that, on account of these differences, which he will have but small, of government and discipline, they treat one another as persons excommunicated †. If we descend to particulars in these Confessions of Faith, how many points shall we find in some which are not in others? And in reality, were the difference in words only, their obstinacy would be too great not to agree after so frequently attempting it: if in ceremonies only, their weakness would be too great in insisting on them; but the truth is, they are all sensible how little they agree in the main; and if they boast of being well united, this only serves to confirm, that the union of the new Reformation is rather political than ecclesiastic.

Nothing now remains but to entreat our brethren to consider the great steps they have seen taken, not by private men, but by their whole Churches, touching matters decided by them with all the authority, said they, of the word of God: yet all these decrees came to nothing. It is a way of speaking in the Reformation always to name the word of God: they believe a thing never the more for that, nor fear the least to suppress what they had advanced under the sanction of so great an authority; but we must not wonder at it. There is nothing in religion more authentic than Confessions of Faith; nothing ought to have been better warranted by the word of God than what the Calvinists had inserted in them against the Real Presence and the other dogmata of the Lutherans. It was not only Calvin that accounted, as detestable, the invention of the Corporeal Presence; *De corporali præsentiâ detestabile commentum* [*]: the whole Reformation of France had just said, in body, by the mouth of Beza, that she detested this monster, as well the Lutheran Consubstantiation as the Papistical Transubstantiation. But there is nothing sincere, nor serious, in these detestations of the Real Presence, since they were ready to retrench all that had been said against it, and this, not only by decree of a national Synod, but by a joint determination of the whole party solemnly assembled at Frankfort. The doctrine of the figurative sense, not to speak here of other points, after so many battles and such a number of pretended martyrs, would have been buried in eternal silence, had it but pleased the Lutherans. England, France, Germany, Switzerland, the Low Countries, in a word, all the Calvinists any where to be found, consented to this suppression. How therefore can men remain so wedded to a tenet, which they see so little revelation for, that it is already cast forth from the profession of Christianity by the concurrent wishes of the whole party.

---

* Jur. Syst. p. 214.

† Id. avis. aux Prot. n. 3, at the beginning of his Prej. Legit.

---

[*] 2 Def. cont. Westp. opusc. 83. S. n. 9.

BOOK XIII.

THE DOCTRINE CONCERNING ANTICHRIST, AND VARIATIONS ON THIS SUBJECT FROM LUTHER'S TIME DOWN TO THIS.

A brief Summary.—Variations of the Protestants in regard to Antichrist.—Luther's own predictions.—Calvin's evasion.—What Luther lays down, as to this Doctrine, is contradicted by Melancthon.—A new article of Faith added to the Confession in the Synod of Gap.—The foundation of this decree manifestly false.—This Doctrine despicable in the Reformation.—The absurdities, contrarieties, and impieties of the new interpretation of prophecies proposed by Joseph Mede, and maintained by the minister Jurieu.—The most holy Doctors of the Church enrolled amongst Blasphemers and Idolaters.

1.—*Article added to the Confession of Faith on purpose to declare the Pope Antichrist.*

The disputes of Arminius raised great combustions in the United Provinces, and it were now time to treat of them: but as the questions and decisions resulting from them are of a more particular discussion, before I engage therein, a famous decree should be mentioned of the Synod of Gap, the account of which was deferred, not to interrupt the affair of Piscator.

It was therefore in this Synod and in 1603, that a new decree was made to declare the Pope Antichrist. This decree was counted of so great importance that it passed into a new article of faith, the thirty-first in order, and took place after the thirtieth, it being there said that all true pastors are equal; so that what gives the Pope the character of Antichrist, is his styling himself superior to other bishops. If it be so, it is a great while since Antichrist has reigned; nor do I conceive why the Reformation has so long deferred enrolling in the catalogue of this great number of Antichrists she has introduced, St. Innocent, St. Leo, St. Gregory, and the rest of the Popes whose epistles shew us the exercise of this superiority in every page.

2.—*Luther's empty prophecies, and Calvin's as empty shift.*

Now when Luther so greatly exaggerated this new doctrine of the Antichristian papacy, he did it with that prophetic air above remarked in him *. We have seen in what a strain he foretold the downfal of the Papal power; and how his preaching was that breath of Jesus Christ which was to overthrow the man of sin; without arms, without violence, by himself alone, without any intervening power: so dazzled, so intoxicated was he with the unexpected effect of his eloquence! The whole Reformation was in expectation of the speedy accomplishment of this new prophecy. But when they saw the Pope still keep his ground (for many more than Luther will split against this rock), and that the Pontifical power, so far from tumbling at the blast of this false prophet, maintained itself against the conspiracy of so many revolted powers, insomuch that the attachment of God's people to this sacred authority, which makes the band of their unity, redoubled rather than was weakened by so numerous a defection, they laughed at the illusion of Luther's prophecies, and at their weak credulity who took them for celestial oracles. Yet Calvin had his evasion ready when he said to one that ridiculed them †, that "though the body of the Papacy subsisted still, the spirit and life had forsaken it so as to leave nothing but a dead carcass." Thus men will run the hazard of a prophecy, and if the event does not answer, a flash of wit brings them off.

3.—*Daniel and St. Paul brought in to no purpose.*

But they tell us with a serious air it is a prophecy, not of Luther's, but of the Scripture, and evidently to be seen (so it should since it is an article of faith) in St. Paul, and in Daniel. As for the Revelations, Luther did not think fit to employ this book, nor receive it into his canon. But for St. Paul ‡, what could be more evident, seeing that the Pope sitteth in the temple of God? In the Church, says Luther §, that is questionless in the true Church, the true temple of God; it being unexampled in Scripture, that a temple of idols was ever called by this name: so that the first step they must make towards a right understanding how the Pope is Antichrist, is to acknowledge that Church, wherein he presides, for the true Church. What follows is not less manifest. Who does not see how "the Pope sheweth himself that he is God, exalting himself above all that is worshipped?" Chiefly in that sacrifice so much condemned by our Reformers, in which, for proof that he is God, the Pope confesses his sins with all the people; raises himself above every thing by entreating all the saints and all his brethren to beg forgiveness for him; also by declaring afterwards, and in the most holy part of this sacrifice, that he hopes this forgiveness, "not through his own merits, but through the bounty and grace, and in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord?" A new kind of Antichrist, that obliges all his adherents to place their hope in Jesus Christ, and for always having been the most firm assertor of his divinity, is placed by the Socinians at the head of all Antichrists, as the chief of them all, and as the most incompatible with their doctrine.

---

* Sup. l. i. n. 31.

† Gratul. ad Ven. Presbyt. opusc. p. 331.

‡ 2 Thess. ii. 4.

§ Sup. l. iii. n. 50.

4.—*Protestants discredit themselves by this Doctrine.*

But again, if such a dream can deserve our serious attention, which of all these Popes is "that man of sin and the son of perdition specified by St. Paul?" We never met in Scripture with the like expressions, unless to characterize some particular person. No matter for that: all the Popes since St. Gregory, as they said heretofore, and as they say at present, all the Popes since St. Leo, are "this man of sin, this son of perdition, and this Antichrist," though they converted to Christianity England, Germany, Sweden, Denmark, and Holland; so that all these countries, by embracing the Reformation, did publicly acknowledge that they had received Christianity from Antichrist himself.

5.—*Illusions with regard to the Revelations.*

Who can relate here the mysteries our Reformed have found in the Revelations, and the deceitful prodigies of the beast, which are the miracles Rome attributes to saints and their relics; to the end that St. Austin, and St. Chrysostom, and St. Ambrose, and the rest of the Fathers, who, they allow, published the like miracles with unanimous consent, may be the precursors of Antichrist? What shall I say of the character which the beast stamps on the forehead, which in their language means the sign even of the Cross of Jesus Christ, and the holy chrism which is employed to imprint it: to the end that St. Cyprian, and all the other bishops before and after, who most undoubtedly, as is confessed, did apply this character, may be Antichrists; and the faithful, who bore it ever since the origin of Christianity, be stigmatized with the badge of the beast; and the sign of the Son of Man, become the seal of his adversary. It is irksome to relate all their impieties, and for my part, I am verily persuaded, it was these impertinencies and profanations of the holy book of the Revelations, which were seen increasing without end in the new Reformation, that brought the ministers themselves, weary of hearing them, to a resolution in the national synod of Saumur*, "that no pastor should undertake the exposition of the Revelations, without the advice of a provincial synod."

6.—*This Doctrine concerning Antichrist was not till then in any one act of the Reformation: Luther places it among the Smalcaldic articles, but Melancthon opposes it.*

Now although the ministers had never ceased to animate the people by these odious notions of Antichristianism, they had never ventured hitherto to let them appear in the confessions of faith, though never so outrageous against the pope. Luther alone had placed, among the articles of Smalcald, a long article concerning the papacy, more resembling a satirical declamation than a dogmatic article, and in it inserted this doctrine †; but this example was followed by none else. More than this, when Luther proposed the article, Melancthon refused to subscribe it, and we have heard him say, with the general consent of the whole party, that the Pope's superiority was of so great benefit to the church, that were it not established, it ought to be so ‡; nevertheless, it was precisely in this superiority that our Reformed acknowledged the character of Antichrist at the synod of Gap in 1603.

7.—*Decision of the Synod of Gap.—Its false Foundation.*

There they said, "that the Bishop of Rome pretended a dominion over all the churches and pastors, and styled himself God." In what place? in what council? in what profession of faith? it is what they should have specified, this being the foundation of the decree. But they durst not do it, for then it would have appeared they had nothing to produce but the words of some impertinent interpreter, viz., that in a certain manner, and in the sense God speaks to Judges, "Ye are gods," the Pope might be called God. Grotius laughed at this objection of his party, asking them since what time the hyperboles of some flatterer were taken for received dogmata? Nor, indeed, we may safely say it, has this reproach of the Pope's *naming himself God*, any other foundation than this. On this foundation they decide that "he is properly the Antichrist, and the son of perdition pointed at in the word of God, and the beast clothed with scarlet whom the Lord will discomfit, as he promised, and as he has already begun to do:" and this is what was to constitute the thirty-first article of faith for our pretended Reformed of France, according to the decree of Gap, chapter concerning the Confession of Faith. This new article had for title, "Article omitted." The Synod of Rochelle gave orders, in 1607, that this article of Gap, "as most true and conformable to what was foretold in Scripture, and which we see in our days *manifestly fulfilled*, should be inserted in the copies of the Confession of Faith which were to be printed anew." But it was judged of dangerous consequence to suffer a religion, tolerated under certain conditions, and under a determinate confession of faith, to multiply its articles as its ministers should think fit, and a stop was put to the effect of the synod's decree.

---

* Syn. of Saumur. 1596.

† S. l. iv. n. 38.

‡ S. l. iii. n. 39. L. v. n. 24. 1603.

8.—*Occasion of this Decree.*

It may be asked, perhaps, what spirit moved them to this novelty. The secret is discovered by the synod itself. We there read these words in the chapter concerning Discipline: "Forasmuch as many are uneasy for having the Pope called Antichrist, the company protests this is the common belief and confession of *us all*, by ill luck omitted, nevertheless in all precedent editions, and the foundation of our separating from the Church of Rome, a foundation drawn from the Scripture, and sealed with the blood of so many martyrs." Wretched martyrs, who spill their blood for a tenet absolutely forgotten in all the Confessions of Faith! But it is true that of late it is become the most important of all, and the most essential subject of the breach.

9.—*This Doctrine relating to Antichrist, how despised in the Reformation.*

Let us now hearken to an author, who alone makes more noise in his whole party than all the rest, and whom they seem to have intrusted with the whole defence of the cause, none but he any longer entering the lists. Here is what he says in that famous book entitled, "The Accomplishment of the Prophecies [*]." He complains, preferably to everything else, "that this controversy concerning Antichrist had languished a whole century, and was abandoned through policy, and in obedience to popish princes. Had this great and important truth, that popery is Antichristianism, been placed before the eyes of the Reformed, they would not have fallen into that remissness we see them in at this day. But it was so long ago since they had heard the thing mentioned, that they had quite forgotten it." Here, then, is one of the fundamentals of the Reformation; "and nevertheless," continues this author [†], "it so happened, through a manifest blindness, that we were solely bent on controversies which were but *accessories*, and neglected this, that popery is the Antichristian empire." The more he enters into the subject, the warmer his imagination grows. "In my judgment," proceeds he [‡], "this is so capital a truth, that, without it, we cannot be true Christians." And in another place: "Verily," says he, "I so greatly account this an article of a true Christian's faith, that I cannot hold those for good Christians who deny this truth, after that the event and labours of so many great men have set it in so evident a light." Here is a new *fundamental* article which they had not as yet thought on, nay, on the contrary, which the Reformation had unfortunately abandoned: "for," adds he [§], "this controversy was so thoroughly extinguished, that our adversaries believed it dead, and imagined we had renounced this pretension, *and this foundation* of our whole reform."

10.—*Confuted by the most learned Protestants, Grotius, Hammond, Jurieu himself.*

For my own part thus much is true, that I never in my life have met with any man of good sense among our Protestants, that laid stress on this article: in sincerity, they were ashamed of so great an excess, and more in pain how to excuse the transports of their own people that introduced this prodigy into the world, than we were to impugn it. Their ablest men freed us from this labour. It is well known what the learned Grotius wrote on this subject, and how clearly he has demonstrated that the Pope should not be Antichrist [||]. If the authority of Grotius seem not weighty enough to our Reformed, because truly this learned man, by studying carefully the Scriptures, and reading the ancient ecclesiastical authors, disabused himself by little and little of the errors he was born in, Doctor Hammond, that learned Englishman, was not suspected in the part. Nevertheless, he took no less pains than Grotius to destroy the frenzies of Protestants touching the Antichristianism charged on the Pope.

---

[*] Avis. t. i. p. 48.

[†] Ibid. p. 49.

[‡] Ibid. Acc. des Proph. part i. ch. xvi. p. 292.

[§] Avis. t. i. p. 49, 50.

[||] Avis. p. 4. acc. part i. ch. xvi. p. 291.

These authors, with some others, whom our minister is pleased to call "the shame and reproach, not only of the Reformation, but also of the Christian name *," were in every body's hands, and received the praises not only of the Catholics, but likewise of all the able and moderate men amongst Protestants. Mr. Jurieu himself is moved with their authority. For which reason, in his book of "Lawful Prepossessions †," he delivers all he says of Antichrist as a thing not unanimously received, as a thing undecided, as a picture "whose lineaments are applicable to different subjects, some whereof have already happened, and others perchance are to come." Accordingly, the use he makes of it is as of a prepossession against popery, not as a demonstration. But now the case is quite altered; what was undecided before, is now become the groundwork of the whole Reformation; "for certainly," says our author ‡, "I do not believe this Reformation otherwise well grounded than for this reason, that the church we have abandoned is true Antichristianism." Let them no longer perplex themselves as hitherto, in search of their fundamental articles: here is the foundation of foundations, without which the Reformation would have been unjustifiable. What will then become of it if this doctrine, "popery is true Antichristianism," falls of itself, merely by exposing it? This will be perceived clearly by ever so little attention to what follows.

11.—*Exposition of the Minister Jurieu's Doctrine.*

There needs only to consider that the whole mystery consists in clearly shewing what it is that constitutes this pretended Antichristianism. The next point to be determined, is the beginning of it, its duration and its period, the most speedy that it is possible, in order to comfort those who are wearied with so tedious an expectation. He thinks he has found, in the Revelations, an infallible light for the unfolding of this secret, and supposes, by taking the days for years, that the twelve hundred and sixty days assigned in the Revelations[*] for Antichrist's persecution, make twelve hundred and sixty years: let us take all this for truth, for our business here is not to dispute, but relate historically the doctrine given us for the ground-work of the Reformation.

---

* Avis. p. 4.

† Prej. leg. part i. ch. iv. pp. 72, 73.

‡ Ib. p. 50.

12.—*Mr. Jurieu labours hard to abridge the time of his pretended prophecies.*

At first, he is very much puzzled about these twelve hundred and sixty years of persecution. Persecution is very wearisome, and gladly would he find a speedy end put to it: it is what our author openly manifests; for since what happened last in France, "my soul being cast," says he[†], "into the deepest abyss of grief that I ever felt in my life, I was willing for my comfort to find grounds to hope a speedy deliverance for the church." Bent on this design, he goes to search "even in the fountain head of the Sacred Oracles, to see," says he[‡], "whether the Holy Ghost would not teach me, in regard to *the approaching downfal* of the Antichristian empire, something more sure and more precise than what other interpreters had discovered in them."

13.—*This Author owns his prevention.*

Men generally find, right or wrong, whatever they have a mind in prophecies, that is, in obscure places and enigmatic sayings, when violent prejudices accompany them. This author acknowledges his own: "I will own it," says he[§], "with sincerity, that I approached these divine oracles full of my prejudices, and entirely disposed to believe that we were near to the end of the reign and empire of Antichrist." As he confesses himself prepossessed, he desires also to be read with favourable preventions[||]: if so, he is persuaded you cannot but enter into his notions; all will go on smoothly with this allowance.

14.—*He forsakes his guides, and why.*

Here is he then well convicted, by his own confession, that he commenced reading the word of God, not with a mind disengaged from his prejudices, and thereby in a fit temper to receive the impressions of divine light; but, on the contrary, with a mind "full of its prejudices," disheartened with persecutions, absolutely determined to find the end of them, and the approaching overthrow of this so irksome an empire. He finds all the interpreters put it off to a distant date. Joseph Mede, whom he had chosen for his guide, and who had indeed set out so much to his liking, lost his way at last; for whereas he hoped, by the means of so good a guide, "to see the persecution ended in five and twenty or thirty years' time," to accomplish what Mede proposes, he must stay many ages. "Thus are we," says he [*], "very much retarded, and greatly remote from our reckoning: we must still wait these many ages." This was too much for a man in such haste to see an end, and to publish better tidings to his brethren.

---

[*] Rev. xi. xii. xiii.
[†] Avis. p. 4.
[‡] Ibid. pp. 7, 8.
[§] Ibid. p. 8.
[||] Ibid. p. 53.

15.—*The impossibility of settling the beginning of these twelve hundred and sixty years which the Reformation allows to the persecution of Antichrist.*

But after all, do what he will, he is obliged to find full twelve hundred and sixty years of persecution. To give a speedy end to them, it is necessary to date the beginning early. The greatest number of the Calvinists had begun this reckoning from the time we began, as they pretended, to say mass, and to adore the Eucharist; for that was the god Mauzzim, whom Antichrist was to worship, according to Daniel [†]. Among other fine allegories, there was somewhat of a resemblance in sound betwixt Mauzzim and the mass. Crespin makes a mighty stir with this in his "History of the Martyrs [‡]," and the whole party is ravished with the invention. But how! place the adoration of the Eucharist in the first ages? it is too soon: in the tenth or eleventh, in Berengarius's time? that may be done; those are ages the Reformation is little concerned about: but after all, supposing these twelve hundred and sixty whole years to commence in the tenth or eleventh century, there would remain still six hundred and sixty years of troublesome times to rub through. Our author is disheartened at this, and his ingenuity would be of little service, could it not furnish him with some more favourable expedient.

16.—*New date given to the birth of Antichrist by this Minister in his prepossessions.*

Until now the party had shewn a regard for St. Gregory. It is true, masses were discovered in him abundantly, even for the dead, invocations of saints in plenty, a number of relics; and what is very disagreeable to the Reformation, a strong persuasion of the authority of his see. Yet, for all this, his holy doctrine and holy life made him be revered. Luther and Calvin had called him the last bishop of Rome; his successors were nothing but Popes and Antichrists; but as for him, it was not feasible to make him of that number. Our author was bolder, and in his "Lawful Prepossessions" (for he began there to be inspired to interpret the Revelations) after frequently deciding with all his interpreters, that Antichrist must begin with the ruin of the Roman empire, he declared *, "This empire ceased when Rome ceased to be the capital city of the provinces, when this empire was dismembered into ten parts, which happened at the end of the fifth century, and at the beginning of the sixth." This he repeats four or five times, that you may not doubt of it, and at last concludes thus †: "It is, then, certain, that at the beginning of the sixth age, the corruptions of the church were great enough, and the pride of the bishop of Rome already risen high enough, to make us determine *on this era* for the first birth of the Antichristian empire." And again ‡: "One may well reckon for the birth of the Antichristian empire a time, wherein were already seen all the sprouts of future corruption and tyranny." And, finally, "this dismembering of the Roman empire into ten pieces, happened about the year 500, a little before the end of the fifth century, and at the beginning of the sixth." It is, then, manifest we must begin from thence to count the twelve hundred and sixty years assigned for the duration of the Popish empire.

---

[*] Accomp. part ii. ch. iv. p. 60.

[†] Dan. xi. 38.

[‡] Hist. des Mart. by Cresp. l. i.

17.—*The times do not tally right with it, by reason of the sanctity of the then Popes.*

Unfortunately, the Church of Rome is not found sufficiently corrupted in those days to make an Antichristian church of her, for the Popes of those times were the most zealous defenders of the mysteries of the incarnation and redemption of mankind, and withal as illustrious for sanctity as ever the church had. We need but hear the encomium which Dionysius Parvus §, so learned and pious a man, gives St. Gelasius the Pope, who was seated in St. Peter's chair from the year 492 to the year 496. We shall there see, that the whole life of this holy Pope was either reading or prayer: his fasting, his poverty, and, in the poverty of his life, his immense charity to the poor, his doctrine, in short, and his so great watchfulness, that made him account the least remissness in a pastor of dangerous consequence to souls, formed in him such a bishop as St. Paul describes. This is the Pope whom this learned man beheld in the chair of St. Peter towards the end of the fifth century, when, it seems, Antichrist was born. Even a hundred years after him, St. Gregory the Great was seated in this chair, and the whole church, in the East no less than in the West, was replenished with the odour of his virtues, amongst which his humility and zeal shone conspicuous. Nevertheless, he was seated in the chair, which "began to be the seat of pride, and that of the beast*." These are fine beginnings for Antichrist. Had these Popes been pleased to be something more wicked, and defended with less zeal the mystery of Jesus Christ and the cause of piety, the system would fit better; but every thing is settled: Antichrist, then, was only in his minority†, and in this nonage nothing hindered his being a Saint, and a most zealous defender of Jesus Christ and his kingdom. These were our author's discoveries at the beginning of the year 1685, and when he composed his "Lawful Prepossessions."

---

* Prej. leg. part i. p. 82. † Ibid. pp. 83, 85. ‡ Ib. p. 128.
§ Pref. Coll. decret. cod. Hist. t. i. p. 183.

18.—*The Author changes his mind, and is for advancing the overthrow of Antichrist.*

But upon his observing, towards the end of the same year, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, with all the consequences of it, this great event made him change his prophecies, and advance the time of the downfal of Antichrist's kingdom. The author would have it in his power to say, he hoped to live to be an eye-witness of it. In 1686, he published his great work of the "Accomplishment of the Prophecies‡," wherein he determines the period of the Antichristian persecution at the year 1710, or at least in 1714 or 1715. But he informs his reader that, after all, he thinks it a difficult matter to mark precisely the year. "God," says he, "in his prophecies, *looks not into matters so minutely*." Stupendous maxim! Nevertheless, "one may say," proceeds he, "this must happen between the year 1710 and the year 1715." This we may depend upon, and what he calls persecution will be at an end for certain, at the beginning of the eighteenth century; so we draw near the point: scarce five-and-twenty years remain. Which of the zealous Calvinists would not have patience, and wait so short a term?

---

* Prej. leg. part i. p. 147. † Ibid. 128. ‡ Acc. part ii, ch. ii. pp. 18, 28.

19.—*He is obliged to make him be born in the person of St. Leo the Great.*

The truth is, there is some difficulty in the thing; for the more he advances the end of the twelve hundred and sixty years, the higher must he carry the beginning of them, and settle this epoch of the Antichristian empire in still purer times. Thus to finish in 1710, or thereabouts, he must have begun the Antichristian persecution in the year 450 or 454, under the Pontificate of St. Leo; and accordingly it is what the author chooses after Joseph Mede, who, in our days, has made himself famous in England by his learned extravagancies on the Revelations, and the other prophecies employed against us.

20.—*Absurdity of this System.*

It seems as if God had a design to confound these impostors by filling the chair of St. Peter with the greatest men and greatest Saints it ever had, at the time which was selected to make it the seat of Antichrist. Can one but consider the letters and sermons wherein St. Leo inspires, even at this day, so forcibly into his readers the faith of Jesus Christ, and believe that an Antichrist was the author of them? But what other Pope has impugned more vigorously the enemies of Jesus Christ, has maintained with more zeal both Christian grace and ecclesiastical discipline, and, in fine, given to the world a more holy doctrine, with more holy examples? He, whose sanctity made him be revered by the barbarous Attila, and saved Rome from massacre, is the first Antichrist, and father of all the rest. It was Antichrist that held the Fourth General Council, so respected by all good Christians; it was Antichrist that dictated the divine letter to Flavian, which was the admiration of the whole church, wherein the mystery of Jesus Christ is so sublimely and so distinctly explained, that the Fathers of this great Council cried out at each word, "Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo;" whereas they should have said, by his mouth Antichrist has spoken, or rather, Peter and Jesus Christ himself have spoken by the mouth of Antichrist. Must not a man have drank deep, even to the dregs of that infatuating cup, the potion of the lying prophets of old, and turned his head quite giddy with its fumes, to vent to the world such delirious exorbitancies?

21.—*Idle shift of the Minister.*

At this part of the prophecy, the new prophet foresaw the indignation of mankind, and that of Protestants no less than Catholics; for he is forced to own that, from Leo the First to Gregory the Great, inclusively, Rome had a great many good bishops *, of whom he must make as many Antichrists, and hopes to satisfy the world by saying they were "Antichrists commenced." But after all, if the twelve hundred and sixty years of Antichristian persecution begin then, he must either abandon the sense he gives to the prophecy, or say, that then "the holy city was trod under foot by the Gentiles †; the two witnesses," namely, "the small number of the faithful," were put to death, "the woman with child," to-wit, the church, "was driven into the wilderness," and deprived at least of the public exercise of religion; that from that time, in short, began the execrable "blasphemies of the beast against the name of God, and against all those that dwell in heaven, and the war she waged against the Saints ‡." For it is set down expressly in St. John, that all this was to continue a thousand two hundred and threescore days, which he will have to be years. To make these blasphemies, this war, this Antichristian persecution, and this triumph of error, to begin in the Church of Rome, even from the time of St. Leo, St. Gelasius, and St. Gregory, and make it hold on for the space of all these ages, when unquestionably that church was the model of all other churches, not in faith alone, but also in piety and discipline, is the height of all extravagancy.

22.—*Two bad characters imputed to St. Leo.*

But again, what has St. Leo done to deserve to be the first Antichrist? He could not be Antichrist for nothing. Here are the three characters he gives to Antichristianism, which must be made to agree with the time of St. Leo, and with him in person; "Idolatry, tyranny, and corruption of manners §." How deplorable, to be reduced to defend St. Leo against Christians, from all these reproaches! but charity constrains us to it. Let us begin by the corruption of manners. But then nothing is objected against him on this head: nothing can be found in the life of this great Pope but examples of sanctity. In his time ecclesiastical discipline was still in its full vigour, and St.

---

* Acc. part ii. ch. ii. pp. 39, 40, 41.

† Rev. xi. 2.

‡ Acc. part ii. ch. x. p. 159. Rev. xii. 6, 14. xiii. 5, 6.

§ Ibid. ch. ii. pp. 18, 28.

Leo was the support of it. Thus you see how manners were corrupted. Let us run over the other characters, that of tyranny next, in as few words. Ever since the time of St. Leo, objects our author *, "who was sitting in the year 450, to that of St. Gregory the Great, the Bishops of Rome have laboured to arrogate to themselves a superiority over the universal church:" but was it St. Leo that began? He dares not say it; all he says is, "he laboured at it," for he knows full well that St. Celestin his predecessor, and St. Boniface, and St. Zozimus, and St. Innocent, to go no further back at present, acted no otherwise than St. Leo; nor were they less zealous in maintaining the authority of St. Peter's chair. Why should they not, then, be of the number, at least, of these "Antichrists commenced." The reason is, because, had he began from their time, the twelve hundred and threescore years would have elapsed already, and the event would have belied the sense he is resolved to give the Revelations. Thus do men impose on the world, and turn the divine oracles to their own fancy.

23.—*St. Leo's idolatry.—The Mauzzims of Daniel applied to the Saints.*

But it is time we should come to the third character of the beast, which our adversaries are determined to find in St. Leo, and in the whole church of his time. There is a new Paganism, an idolatry worse than that of the Gentiles, in the honour paid to saints and their relics. It is on this third character the chief stress is laid: Joseph Mede † has the honour of this invention, who interpreting these words of Daniel, "he shall honour the God Mauzzim," to wit, as he translates it, "the God of forces:" and again, "he shall do it to fence Mauzzim with a strange God;" understands this of Antichrist, who shall call the saints his fortresses.

24.—*St. Basil and the rest of the Saints of those times accused of the same Idolatry.*

But how can he find that Antichrist will give the saints this name? "In this," says he, "that St. Basil has preached to all his people, or rather to the whole universe, who have read and approved his divine sermons, that the forty martyrs, whose relics they possessed, 'were towers whereby the city was defended*.' " St. Chrysostom† has also said, " that the relics of St. Peter and Paul were more secure towers for Rome than ten thousand ramparts." "Is not this," concludes Mede, "raising up the gods Mauzzims?" St. Basil and St. Chrysostom are the Antichrists who erect these fortresses against the true God.

---

* Acc. des Proph. part ii. ch. ii. p. 41.

† Expos. of Dan, ch. xi. n. 36, &c. Book iii. ch. xvi. xvii. p. 666, et seq. Dan. xi. 38, 39.

25.—*Other Saints likewise Idolaters.*

Yet not they alone: the poet Fortunatus hath sung after St. Chrysostom, "that Rome had two ramparts and two towers in St. Peter and St. Paul." St. Gregory has said as much of them. St. Chrysostom, "that the holy martyrs of Egypt protect us like impregnable ramparts, like unshaken rocks, against our invisible enemies." And Mede still replies, "are not these Mauzzims?" he adds, " that St. Hilary discovers likewise our bulwarks in the angels ‡." He cites St. Gregory, of Nyssa, brother to St. Basil, Gennadius, St. Eucherius, Theodoret, and the prayers of the Greeks, in proof of the same. He does not forget that the Cross is called our defence, and that our common expression is, " we fortify ourselves with the sign of the Cross;" *Munire se signo Crucis* §: the Cross comes in amongst the rest, and this sacred symbol of our salvation must also be ranked amongst the Mauzzims of Antichrist.

26.—*St. Ambrose added to the rest by Mr. Jurieu.*

Mr. Jurieu sets off all these fine passages of Joseph Mede to the best advantage ||; and not to be a mere transcriber, adds to them St. Ambrose, who says, " the saints Gervase and Protase were the tutelary angels of the city of Milan." He might also have named St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Austin, and, in short, all the Fathers who abound in as strong expressions. All this is making as many gods of the saints, because it is making of them *ramparts* and *rocks* where is found a secure sanctuary, names which the Scripture appropriates to God.

27.—*The Ministers cannot believe what they say themselves.*

These men know well, in their own consciences, that the Fathers, whom they quote, never understood it so: but meant

---

* Expos. of Dan. ch. xvii. p. 673. Bas. Orat. in 40. Mart. Id. in Maur. Mart.

† Chrys. Hom. 32 ad Rom.

‡ Ib. p. 673. Hom. 70. ad Pop. Ant. Orat. in 40. Mart.

§ Ibid. p. 678.

|| Acc. des Proph. part i. ch. xiv. pp. 248, 249, et seq. Ib. p. 235. Mede ubi sub. ch. xvi.

only to say, that God gives us in the saints, as heretofore he did in Moses, in David, and in Jeremiah, invincible protectors, whose acceptable prayers are a more secure defence to us than a thousand ramparts: for he is able to make of his saints, when he pleases, and in the manner that he pleases, "impregnable fortresses, iron pillars, and brazen walls *." Our doctors, I say again, are convinced in their hearts that is the sense of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil, when they call the saints towers and fortresses. From these examples they ought to learn, not to take in a criminal sense other as strong expressions, and withal as innocent as these; at least not to carry impiety so far as to make these holy doctors the founders of Antichristian idolatry, this being a charge equally atrocious on the whole church of their times, whose doctrine and worship they did but propound. Nor, indeed, ought we to imagine our ministers believed seriously what they said, and judged so many saints no better than blasphemers and idolators. All that we can conclude from thence is, that they suffer themselves to be transported beyond all bounds, and without enlightening the understanding, seek only to kindle hatred in the heart.

28.—*Why they do not make St. Basil the beginning of Antichristianism as well as St. Leo.*

But after all, if we must hold for Antichrists all these pretended worshippers of Mauzzims, why do they defer to St. Leo's time the beginning of the Antichristian empire †? Let them shew me that in this Pope's days more was done for the saints than acknowledging them for towers and impregnable fortresses? Let them shew me that more trust was put in their prayers, more honour paid to their relics? You say that in 360, and 390, the worship of creatures, that is, in your notion, that of the saints, was not as yet established in the public service: shew me that it was more or less so in St. Leo's time? You say, in the same year of 360, and 390, great precautions were taken not to confound the service of God with the service of creatures then commencing: shew me that less was taken afterwards, and especially in St. Leo's Pontificate? But who ever could have confounded things so well distinguished? We demand things of God; we demand prayers of the saints: whoever dreamt of asking either prayers of God, or the things themselves of the saints as of those that gave them? Shew, then, that in St. Leo's time these so distinct characters were confounded, the service of God, with the honour given to his servants for love of him? you never will undertake it. Why, therefore, stop in so fair a way? dare to utter what you think. Begin by St. Basil, and St. Gregory of Nazianzen, in the reign of Antichristian idolatry, and the blasphemies of the beast against the Eternal, and against all that dwells in heaven: turn into blasphemies against God and against the saints, what has been said ever since that time of the glory God imparted to his servants in the church: St. Basil is no better than St. Leo; nor the church more privileged at the end of the fourth age, than fifty years after the middle of the fifth. But I see the answer you make me in your heart, viz., that should you begin by St. Basil, all would have been completed long ago; and thus belied by the event, you could no longer amuse the people with vain hopes.

---

* Jer. i. 18.

† Acc. part ii. p. 23.

29.—*Ridiculous Calculations.*

Accordingly, our author owns* you might begin his whole calculation from four different epochs: viz., 360, 393, 430, and in fine, 450, or 455, which is the calculation he himself follows. All these four accounts, according to him, agree admirably with the system of the new idolatry†: but unluckily in the two first reckonings, where all things else, as he pretends, agree so well, the chief point is wanting; to wit, that according to these computations the Popish empire should have fallen in 1620, or in 1653. Now it still exists and enjoys a small respite. As to the third calculation, it terminates in 1690, four or five years hence, says our author: it would be too much exposing himself to take so short a term. Yet every concurrence tallied with it to admiration. See what these concurrences are which they build so much on, mere dreams, visions, manifest illusions, proved notoriously such by the event.

30.—*Why St. Basil's Idolatry and that of the other Fathers is not accounted Antichristian.*

"But," says our author, "the chief reason why God will not compute the birth of Antichristianism from these years, 360, 393, and 430, notwithstanding that the new idolatry," which he will have to be the character of Antichristianism, "was then established, is, that there was a fourth characteristic of the birth of this Antichristian empire which had not as yet appeared; namely, that the Roman empire was to be destroyed; that there were to be seven Kings, to wit, according to all the Protestants, seven forms of government in the city on seven mountains, meaning Rome *." The Papal empire was to make the seventh government, and it was requisite the six others should be destroyed to make room for the seventh, which was that of the Pope and Antichrist. When Rome ceased to be mistress, and the Antichristian empire was to commence, it was necessary there should be ten kings, which were to receive the sovereign power at the same time with the beast †; and ten kingdoms, "into which the Roman empire was to be subdivided," according to the oracle of the Revelations. All this was fulfilled in the nick of time under St. Leo: this, therefore, is the precise time of the birth of Antichrist, and there is no resisting the concurrence of such circumstances.

---

* Acc. part ii. p. 20, &c.

† Ibid. p. 22.

31.—*Infinite absurdity.*

Admirable doctrine! neither these ten Kings, nor the dismembering of the empire, entered into the constitution of Antichrist, nor at farthest could this be any thing else than an exterior token of his birth; what truly constitutes him, is the corruption of manners, is the pretension to superiority, is principally the new idolatry. All this is no more to be found under St. Leo, than fourscore or a hundred years before; but God would not, as yet, impute it for Antichristianism, nor did it please him that the new idolatry, though already entirely formed, should be Antichristian. It is impossible, in fine, that such extravagancies, where impiety and absurdity strive together which shall exceed, should not open the eyes of our brethren, and, at length, put them out of conceit with those who delude them with such dreams.

32.—*The system of the Ministers concerning the seven Kings of the Revelations evidently confounded by the very words of this prophecy.*

But let us enter into the particulars of these fine concurrences so dazzling to our Reformed, and begin with the seven Kings, who, according to St. John, are the seven heads of the beast, and with these ten horns, which, according to the same St. John, are ten other kings. The sense, say they, is manifest. "The seven heads," says St. John, "are the seven mountains on which the woman sitteth, and these are seven kings: five are fallen; one and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh he must continue a short space; and the beast that was and is not, even he is the eighth king, and one of the seven, and goeth into destruction*." The seven kings are, says our author†, the seven forms of government Rome had been subject to; the kings, the consuls, the dictators, the decemvirs, the military tribunes who had consular power, the emperors, and finally the Pope. Five are fallen, says St. John: five of these governments had expired when he wrote his prophecy: one is still; the empire of the Cæsars under which he wrote: and the other must come soon; who does not espy the Papal empire? It is one of the seven kings: one of the seven forms of government, and it is also the eighth king, namely, the eighth form of government: the seventh, because the Pope much resembles emperors by the dominion which he exercises; and the eighth, because he has somewhat peculiar, his spiritual empire, his dominion over consciences; all mighty just, but for one little word that mars the whole. In the first place, I would fain ask, why the seven kings are seven forms of government, and not seven real kings. Let them shew me in Scripture, that the forms of government are named kings; on the contrary, three verses after, I see that the ten kings are ten real kings, and not ten sorts of government. Why should these seven kings of verse the ninth, be so different from the ten kings of verse the twelfth? Does he pretend to make us believe that the consuls, annual magistrates, are kings? that the entire extirpation of the regal power of Rome is one of the seven kings of Rome? that ten men, the decemviri, are one king; and the whole series of four or six military tribunes, more or less, another king? But in good truth, is that another form of government? who is ignorant that the military tribunes differed not from consuls, except in the number? for which reason they were called *Tribuni militum Consulari potestate;* and if St. John had a mind to denote all the names of the supreme power among the Romans, why did he forget the Triumviri? had they not, at least, as much power as the Decemviri? And should it be said, it was too short to deserve notice, why should that of the Decemviri, which held but two years, deserve it more? This is true, they may reply: let us put them in lieu of the Dictators, for there is little likelihood the Dictatorship could ever be called a form of government under which Rome continued for a certain time.

---

* Acc. part ii. p. 23. Rev. xvii. 9.

† Rev. xvii. 12.

---

* Rev. xvii. 3, 9, 12. Ib. 9, 10, 11.

† Acc. part i. p. 11.

It was an extraordinary magistracy, set up according to the exigency of present circumstances in all times of the republic, not a particular form of government. Let us remove them then, and put the Triumviri in their stead. I consent to it, and even willingly give to the interpretation of Protestants the best appearance it is capable of: for when all is said, there is nothing in it but illusion; one little word, as I said, will subvert the whole fabric; for in short, we read of the seventh king (who shall be, since they will have it, the seventh government), that, "when he cometh, he must continue a short space*." St. John has but just shewn him; and immediately, says he, "he goeth into destruction." If this be the Papal empire, it must needs be short. Now it is pretended from St. John, that it must continue at least one thousand two hundred and threescore years, as long a time, as is owned by our new interpreter, "as all the other governments together†." Wherefore it is impossible the Papal empire should be meant by this prophecy.

33.—*Trifling reply.*

But replies our author, "one day," as says St. Peter‡, "is with the Lord as a thousand years." A fine discovery! all equally is short to the eyes of God, and not only the reign of the seventh king, but also the reign of all the rest. Now St. John would distinguish this seventh king by comparing him with the other kings, and his reign was to be remarkable by the shortness of its continuance. To shew this characteristic in the Papal government, who does not see that its being short in the sight of God, with whom nothing is durable, is not sufficient? It ought to be short in comparison with the other governments; more short by consequence than that of the military Tribunes, which scarce subsisted thirty or forty years; more short than that of the Decemviri, which continued but two; more short at least than that of the kings, or consuls, or emperors, who filled up the greatest space of time in duration. But on the contrary, that which St. John has distinguished by the brevity of its duration, does not only hold out longer than any of the rest, but also longer than all the rest together: what more manifest absurdity! and is it not an attempt to make the prophecies ridiculous, thus to interpret them?

---

* Rev. xvii. 10. † Acc. part i. p. 11. ‡ 2 Pet. iii. 8.

34.—*The Ten Kings of the Revelations manifestly as ill interpreted.*

But let us say one word of the ten kings whom our interpreter, after Joseph Mede, believes he triumphs in. There it is he ranges before us*—first, the Britons; second, the Saxons; third, the French; fourth, the Burgundians; fifth, the Visigoths; sixth, the Suevi and Alani; seventh, the Vandals; eighth, the Germans; ninth, the Ostrogoths in Italy, where the Lombards succeed them; tenth, the Grecians. Here are fully ten kingdoms which the Roman empire was divided into at its fall. Without disputing on the qualities, without disputing on the number, without disputing on the dates, this at least is very certain—viz. that as soon as ever these ten kings appear, St. John makes them "give their power and strength unto the Beast†." We own as much, say our interpreters‡; and it is likewise the very thing that gains our cause; for these are "the ten vassal and subject kings which the Antichristian empire, namely, the Pontifical, hath always had in subjection to worship it, and maintain its power." Here is a wonderful tallying of incidents: but what, I pray, have the Arian kings contributed to the establishment of the Papal empire, such as the Visigoths and the Ostrogoths, the Burgundians and the Vandals; or the Heathen kings, such as at that time were the French and Saxons? Are these the ten vassal kings of the Papacy, who had nothing else to do but worship it? But when was it that these Vandals and Ostrogoths worshipped the Popes? Was it under Theodoric and his successors, when the Popes groaned under their tyranny? or under Genseric, when, with the Vandals, he pillaged Rome and carried the spoils of it into Africa? And since even the Lombards are introduced, were they also of the number that aggrandized the Church of Rome, they that did all in their power to oppress her as long as ever they subsisted, namely, for two hundred years? For what else were, during this whole space of time, the Alboini, the Astolphi, and the Didiers, but enemies to Rome, and the Church of Rome? And the Emperors of the East, who were in reality the Emperors of Rome, though ranged here the last under the name of Greeks, must they also be reckoned amongst the vassals and subjects of the Pope, they whom St. Leo and his successors, down to the time of Charlemagne, acknowledged for their sovereigns? But, you will say, these Heathen and heretical kings embraced the true faith. Right; they embraced it a long while after this division into ten kingdoms. The French had four Heathen kings: the Saxons were not converted till the time of St. Gregory, a hundred and fifty years after this division: the Goths, who reigned in Spain, were converted from Arianism at the same time. What has this to do with these kings, who, according to the pretension of our interpreters, were to begin to reign at the same time with the Beast, and give up their power to him? Besides, can no other era be found for the entrance of these kings into the Antichristian empire, but that of their turning Christians, or Catholics? What a happy destiny for this pretended Antichristian empire, to be compounded of people converted to Jesus Christ! But what is it, after all, that these kings, so happily converted, have contributed to the establishment of the Pope's authority? If, at their admittance into the Church they acknowledged the First See, which was that of Rome, neither did they give him that supremacy which he had undoubtedly before their conversion, nor did they acknowledge, in the Pope, any thing more than Christians had acknowledged in him before them, to wit, the successor of St. Peter. Nor did the Popes, on their side, exercise their authority over these people otherwise than by teaching them the true faith, and upholding regularity and discipline among them: nor can any man show, during this time, or four hundred years after, that they concerned themselves with any thing else, or enterprised any thing on temporals. Thus you see what were these ten kings, with whom the Papal empire was to commence.

---

* Prej. legit. part i. ch. vii. p. 126. Acc. des. Proph. part ii. pp. 27, 28.

† Rev. xvii. 13.

‡ Acc. part i. ch. xv. p. 266.

35.—*Vain reply.*

But then, we are told*, came other ten in their place, and these are they with their kingdoms: first, Germany; second, Hungary; third, Poland; fourth, Sweden; fifth, France; sixth, England; seventh, Spain; eighth, Portugal; ninth, Italy; tenth, Scotland. Expound who can why Scotland stands here rather than Bohemia; why Sweden rather than Denmark or Norway; why, in fine, Portugal, as separated from Spain, rather than Castile, Arragon, Leon, Navarre, and the other kingdoms? But why do we lose our time in examining these fancies? Let them resolve me at least this question, whether or no these were the ten kingdoms that were to be formed out of the remnants of the Roman empire at the same time that Antichrist was to appear, and which were to resign their authority and power to him? What has Poland to do here, and the other kingdoms of the North, which Rome was not acquainted with, and which, beyond question, were not formed of her ruins when the Antichrist, St. Leo, came into the world? Is it in banter that men write, with so serious an air, such ridiculous conceits? In good truth, it ill becomes those who have nothing in their mouths but the pure word of God, thus rashly to sport with its oracles; and if they have nothing more pertinent whereby to explain the prophecies, it were much better to adore their sacred obscurity, and respect the future, which God has reserved in his own hands.

---

* Prej. part i. ch. vi. p. 105.

36.—*Contrarieties of the new Interpreters.*

We must not wonder to see these daring interpreters at variance among themselves, and destroying one another. Joseph Mede, on that verse of St. John, importing that in a great earthquake "the tenth part of the city fell[*]," thought he had hit exactly, when he interpreted this tenth part with respect to the new Antichristian Rome, which is ten times less than ancient Rome. To come at the proof of his interpretation, he seriously compares the area of old Rome with that of the new, and with a fine figure demonstrates that the first is ten times greater than the last: but his disciple, Mr. Jurieu, deprives him of so mathematical an interpretation. "He is mistaken with all the rest," cries out haughtily the new prophet[†], "when by the city St. John speaks of, he understands only the city of Rome." "We ought to hold for certain," proceeds he in a masterly strain, "that the great city is Rome with its empire[‡]." And the tenth part of the city, what shall it be? He has found it out: "France," says he, "is the tenth part[§]." But how? shall France fall? and does this prophet forebode so ill of his own country? No, no, she may be reduced indeed to a tottering condition; let her look to it, the prophet threatens her: yet shall not perish. What the Holy Ghost here means by saying she shall fall, is "that she shall fall with respect to Popery[||];" but then she shall rise more illustrious than ever, because she shall embrace the Reformation, and that speedily; and our kings (a thing I am loth to repeat) are on the point of being Calvinistically reformed. What patience is able to support these interpretations? But after all, he is more in the right than he imagined, by calling this a "fall:" dreadful indeed would be the "fall" into a "reformation," wherein the spirit of illusion so forcibly predominates.

---

[*] Rev. xi. 13. Med. comm. in apoc. part ii. p. 489.
[†] Acc. p. ii. ch. xi. p. 191. [‡] Ibid. pp. 200, 203. [§] Ib. 201. [||] Ibid.

37.—*The Englishman finds England, and the Frenchman France, in the Revelations.*

If the French interpreter finds France in the Revelations, the Englishman finds England in them: the phial poured out upon the rivers and fountains of waters, "are the Pope's emissaries, and the Spaniards vanquished in Queen Elizabeth's reign of glorious memory." But good Mr. Mede*, it seems, was in a gross mistake: his more enlightened disciple assures us†, the second and third phial "were the crusades, when God returned upon Catholics blood for the blood of the Vaudois and Albigenses spilt by them." These Vaudois and Albigenses, John Wickliff and John Huss, with all the rest of that gang, even to the bloody Taborites, appear throughout these new interpretations as faithful witnesses of the truth persecuted by the Beast; but they are now well known, and even this were enough to prove the falsity of these pretended prophecies.

38.—*The King of Sweden foretold, and the prediction falsified immediately after.*

Joseph Mede had outdone himself in his exposition of the fourth phial. He saw it "poured out upon the sun, upon the chief part of the heaven possessed by the Beast‡,"—namely, the Papal empire: the meaning whereof was, that the Pope was going to lose the empire of Germany, which is his sun: nothing more clear. Whilst Mede, if you will believe him, was printing these things, "which he had meditated on long before §," he heard of the wonderful achievements "of that pious, happy, and victorious king, whom God had sent from the North to defend his cause:" in a word, it was the great Gustavus. Mede can no longer doubt but his conjecture was an inspiration; and applies to this great king the same canticle that David applied to the Messiah: "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty King! combat for the truth, and for justice, proceed prosperously and reign||." But the event belied the prediction; so Mede published at once his prophecy and shame.

---

* Med. comm. Apo. p. 528. ad Phial. Ap. iii. p. 16.

† Acc. des Proph. part ii. ch. iv. p. 72. Prej. legit. part i. ch. v. pp. 98, 99.

‡ Com. Ap. p. 528. Rev. xvi. 8.

§ Com. Ap. p. 529.

|| Psalm xliv.

39.—*Ridiculous conceit about the Turks.*

No less remarkable is that fine passage, where, whilst Mede is contemplating the overthrow of the Turkish empire, his disciple, on the contrary, spies in it the victories gained by that empire. The Euphrates in the Revelations*, is to Mede † the empire of the Turks; and the waters of the Euphrates dried up at the effusion of the sixth phial, is the Turkish empire destroyed. He is quite in the dark: Mr. Jurieu ‡ demonstrates to us that the Euphrates is the Archipelago and the Bosphorus, which the Turks passed in 1390, in order to possess themselves of Greece and Constantinople. More than this§: "there is great likelihood that the conquests of the Turks are carried on thus far in order to give them the means of contributing, together with Protestants, to the great work of God,—namely, to the destruction of the Papal empire: for though the Turks have never been so low as at present" (this is the very thing that makes our author believe they will soon rise again,) "I look upon, (says he,) this year 1685, as critical in this affair. God hath humbled the Reformed and the Turks at the same time, *to raise them up again at the same time*, and in order to make them the instruments of his revenge against the Popish empire." Who would not admire this sympathy of Turkism with the Reformation, and this common destiny of them both? Should the Turks prove successful, then will the Reformed (whilst the rest of Christians grieve at their victories) raise up their heads, and believe that the time of their deliverance is at hand. We were strangers as yet to this new excellency of the Reformation—of its being to increase and decrease as it were by sympathy with the Turks. Our author himself was puzzled at this place when he composed his allowable "Prepossessions," and knew nothing of the plagues of the two last phials wherein this mystery was locked up: but at last, "after knocking two, four, five," and "six times, with a religious attention, the door flew open||," and he beheld this mighty secret.

40.—*Why these absurdities are tolerated in the party.*

Men of sense, you will tell me, among the Protestants, laugh at these fooleries as well as we. Yet they let them take their run, knowing them necessary to amuse the credulous multitude. It was principally by these visions that hatred was excited against the church of Rome, and hopes fomented of her speedy overthrow. The same artifice is employed again for the same purpose, and the people, a hundred times deceived, give ear to them, as the Jews, abandoned to the spirit of error, did heretofore to false prophets. Examples are quite useless to disabuse a people possessed with prejudice. They believed they saw, in the prophecies of Luther, the expiration of the Papacy so near at hand, that there was not a Protestant who did not hope to be present at its funeral. It was necessary, indeed, to prolong the time, but the same spirit was kept up still, and the Reformation never ceased to be the bubble of these lying prophets, who prophesy the delusions of their frantic brain.

---

* Rev. xvi. 12. † Jos. Mede, ad Ph. vi. p. 529. ‡ Acc. part ii. ch. vii. p. 99.
§ Ibid. p. 101. || Ibid. p. 94.

41.—*The party's Prophets are impostors.—Confession of the Minister Jurieu.*

God forbid I should lose my time in speaking here of a Cotterus, a Drabicius, a Christiana, a Comenius, and all those other visionaries, of whose predictions our minister boasts, and whose errors he acknowledges. None of them, as he pretends, no not even the learned Usher, but must turn prophet. But the same minister frankly owns he was no less mistaken than the rest. Experience proved them all deluded, " and we discover in them," says the minister [*], " so many things in which they blundered, that there is no relying on them." Yet he nevertheless accounts them prophets, and great prophets, Ezekiels and Jeremiahs. He finds " in their visions such majesty and loftiness, that those of the ancient prophets have not more, and a train of miracles as great as ever happened since the apostles [†]." Thus does the chief of our Protestants suffer himself to be imposed on by these false prophets, even after that the event had confounded them: so prevalent is the spirit of illusion in the party; but the true prophets of the Lord deliver themselves in another strain against such impostors as abuse the name of God: " Hear thou, O Hananiah," saith Jeremiah [‡], " this word that I speak in thine ears, and in the ears of all the people. The prophets that have been before me, and before thee of old, and have prophesied good or evil to nations and to kingdoms; when their words came to pass, it was known that they were prophets whom the Lord had truly sent; and the word of the Lord came unto Jeremiah, saying, Go and tell Hananiah, saying, thus saith the Lord; thou hast broken the yokes of wood,"—in token of the people's future deliverance,—" and thou shalt make for them yokes of iron: I will aggravate the yoke of those nations" to whom thou denouncest peace. "Then said the prophet Jeremiah unto Hananiah the prophet, Hear now, Hananiah, the Lord hath not sent thee, but thou makest this people to trust in a lie; therefore, thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will cast thee from off the face of the earth: this year thou shalt die, because thou hast spoken against the Lord; and Hananiah the prophet died the same year, in the seventh month." Thus did he deserve to be confounded who deceived the people in the Lord's name, and the people needed but to open their eyes and take warning.

---

[*] Avis à tous les ch., at the beginning, pp. 5, 67. Ib.

[†] Acc. des Proph. part ii. p. 174. Ibid.

[‡] Jer. xxviii. 7. et seq.

42.—*Their Interpreters no better.*

Our Reformed interpreters are not worth more than our Reformed prophets. The Revelations and the rest of the Prophecies have ever been the subject which the wits of the Reformation have thought themselves at liberty to sport with. Each one has discovered in them his concurrences, whereby the credulous Protestants were always caught. Mr. Jurieu reproves often, as we have seen, Joseph Mede, whom he had chosen for his guide *. Nay, he has pointed out the errors of Du Moulin, his grandfather †, whose interpretations on the prophecies were admired by the whole Reformation; and has even shewed "that the foundation he built upon was destitute of fidelity." Nevertheless, there was abundance of wit, and a very extensive erudition in these visions of Du Moulin; but so it is, the more wit a man has, the more he deceives himself on these occasions; because, the more wit he has, the more he invents, and ventures the more. Du Moulin's fine wit, which must needs exercise itself on futurity, set him on a task for which he was laughed at, even in his own family; and Mr. Jurieu, his grandson, who, perhaps, shews more wit than the rest on this subject, will be but the more certainly the laughter of mankind.

43.—*What the Ministers have discovered in the Revelations touching their Reformers.*

I am ashamed of dwelling so long on visions more chimerical than sick men's dreams. But I ought not to forget what is of greatest importance in this vain mystery of the Protestants. According to the idea they give of the Revelations, nothing should be more distinctly marked in them than the Reformation itself, with its authors, who came to destroy the empire of the Beast; and especially it ought to be marked in the effusion of the "seven phials," in which are foretold, as they pretend, the seven plagues of their Antichristian empire. But what our interpreters descry here, is so ill contrived, that one destroys what the other builds. Joseph Mede* thinks he has found both Luther and Calvin when the phial is poured on the sea, that is on the Antichristian world, and when immediately this sea "is changed into blood like to that of a dead man †." "Here," says he, "is the Reformation; it is a poison that kills every thing: for then every living soul died in the sea." Mede takes care to explain this blood like to that of a carcass, and says, it is as the blood of a member lopped off, on account "of the provinces and kingdoms which were then rent from the body of the papacy ‡." This is an ill-boding spectacle for Protestants, to see the reformed nations exhibited to them in no other view than that of "lopped members," which have lost, according to Mede, "all connexion with the fountain of life, all vital spirit, and all warmth," without telling us any more of the matter.

---

* Jur. Acc. des. Proph. part i. p. 71.

† Part ii. p. 183.

44.—*The idea of the Minister Jurieu.*

This is Mede's idea of the Reformation. But if he sees it in the effusion of the second phial, the other interpreter sees it only in the effusion of the seventh, "When there came," says St. John §, "a great voice out of the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, it is done. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; and there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth;" there, says he, is the Reformation ||.

This great commotion, I must own, suits well enough with the disturbances it raised over the whole universe, such as never had been seen before on the score of religion. But here it is he shines most: "the great city was divided into three parts ¶, namely," says our author, "into the Church of Rome, the Lutheran, and the Calvinian; these are the three parties that divide the 'great city,' to wit, the Western Church." I accept the omen; the Reformation breaks unity: in breaking it, she divides herself into two, and leaves unity to the Church of Rome in St. Peter's chair, which is the centre of it. But St. John should not have forgotten that one of the divided parties, the Calvinian, broke again into two pieces, since England, reckoned to appertain to it by our minister, yet makes, in the main, a sect apart. Nor must he say, this division is but light, for, by his own confession, they mutually treat each other as "excommunicated persons*." Accordingly, the Church of England reckons the Calvinists, or Puritans, in the number of Nonconformists; that is, in the number of those whose service she does not allow, nor receives their ministers but by ordaining them anew as pastors, destitute of sanction or character. I might also speak of the other sects which divided the Christian world at the same time with Luther and Calvin, and which, taken together or separately, make a party sufficiently great not to have been omitted in this passage of St. John. And all considered, these men should have given their reformation a more specious character than that of overthrowing every thing, and a more creditable mark than that of pulling to pieces the Western Church, the most flourishing of the whole universe; which has been the greatest of all plagues.

---

* Jos. Mede, ad Ph. ii. Apo. xvi. 3. † Rev. Ibid. ‡ Med. Ibid.
§ Rev. xvi. 17. || Acc. part ii. ch. viii. p. 122. ¶ Rev. Ibid.

---

* S. l. xii. n. 44.

BOOK XIV.

[From the Year 1601, to that part of the Seventeenth Century, wherein the Author wrote and concluded his History.]

A brief Summary.—The excesses of the Reformation, with respect to Predestination and Free Will, discovered in Holland. —Arminius, who owns them, falls into other excesses.—Parties of Remonstrants and Anti-Remonstrants.—The Synod of Dort, where the excesses of Calvinian Justification are clearly approved.—Monstrous Doctrine on the certainty of Salvation, and the justice of the most wicked persons.—Consequences equally as absurd, concerning Infant Sanctification, decided in the Synod.—The Synod's procedure justifies the Church of Rome against Protestants.—Arminianism, in the main, left entire, notwithstanding the decisions of Dort.—Pelagianism tolerated, and the suspicion of Socianism the sole cause of rejecting the Arminians.—The uselessness of Synodical decisions among Protestants.—The Synod of Dort's connivance at an infinity of capital errors, whilst bent on maintaining the particular Dogmata of Calvinism.—These Dogmata confessed at the beginning for essential, at last reduced almost to nothing.—Decree of Charenton for receiving the Lutherans to Communion.—Consequence of this decree, which changes the state of Controversies.—The distinction of articles, Fundamental and not Fundamental, obliges Protestants to own, at last, the Church of Rome for a true Church, affording salvation to her members.—Conference of Cassel between the Lutherans and Calvinists.—Their agreement, wherein decisive grounds are established for Communion under one kind.—Present state of Controversies in Germany.—The opinion concerning Universal Grace prevails in France—Is condemned at Geneva and among the Swiss—The question decided by the Magistrate.—Formulary established.—The errors of this Formulary with respect to the Hebrew text.—Another decree concerning Faith, made at Geneva.—That Church impeached by Mr. Claude of making a schism from the rest of the Churches by her new decisions.—Reflections on the Test, in which the Reality remains entire.—Acknowledgment of the Protestant Church of England, that the Mass and Invocation of Saints may have a good sense.

1.—*Intolerable excesses of Calvinism.—Free-will destroyed, and God made the author of sin.—Beza's words.*

The subject of Grace and Free-will was carried to such lengths in the Reformation, that it was impossible even Protestants themselves should not be at last sensible of these exorbitancies. In order to destroy Pelagianism, which they were determined to fix on the Church of Rome, they had cast themselves into the opposite extremes, insomuch that the very name of Free-will excited a horror in them. There never had been such a thing in men or angels; nay, impossible it should have been: nor had the Stoics themselves ever made Fate more rigid and inflexible. Predestination reached even to sin itself, and God was not less the cause of evil actions than of good; such were Luther's sentiments: Calvin had followed them, and Beza, the most renowned of his disciples, had published "A Brief Exposition of the Chief Points of the Christian Religion," where he laid down this principle, "that God does all things according to his determined counsel, even those that are wicked and execrable[*]."

2.—*Adam's Sin ordained by God.*

He had extended this principle as far as the sin of the first Man, which, according to him, was not committed but by God's will and appointment, on account, that "he having ordained the end [†]," which was to glorify his justice in the punishment of the Reprobate, "must likewise have ordained the proportionable causes leading to that end," to wit, sins which lead to eternal damnation, and in particular that of Adam, the origin of all the rest; so "that the corruption of the principal work of God," namely, the first Man, "did not happen by chance, nor without the decree and just will of God[‡]."

3.—*Inevitable necessity in Adam.*

It is true, this author maintains at the same time, "that the will of man, which was created good, made itself evil[§]:" but then he understands and repeats several times, that what is voluntary, is withal necessary[||]; so that nothing hinders the will of sinning from being ever the less the fatal consequence of a hard and unavoidable necessity; and if men will reply,

---

[*] Ex. de la Foi. chez. Riv. 1560, ch. ii. Conc. 1.

[†] Ib. ch. p. iii. t. iv. part v. p. 35.

[‡] Ib. Conc. part vi. p. 38.

[§] Ib. 39.

[||] Ib. 29, 90, 91. ch. iii. Con. part vi. p. 40.

"that they had not the power of resisting the will of God," Beza does not answer them as he ought to do, that God does not move them to sin, but says only, "they must be left to plead against him, who will be well able to defend his own cause."

4.—*This Doctrine of Beza taken from Calvin.*

This doctrine of Beza was taken from Calvin, who maintains, in express terms [*], "that Adam could not avoid falling, yet was nevertheless guilty, because he fell voluntarily;" which he undertakes to prove in his Institution, and reduces the whole of his doctrine to two principles: the first, that the will of God causes in all things, even in our wills, without excepting that of Adam, an inevitable necessity; the second, that this necessity is no excuse for sinners. Hereby it is plain, he preserves free will in name only, even in the state of innocence; and after this there is no room for disputing whether he makes God the author of sin, since besides his frequently drawing this consequence, it is but too evident, by the principles he lays down, that the will of God is the sole cause of that necessity imposed on all that sin [†].

Nor indeed are Calvin's sentiments, and those of the first reformers, any longer disputed now, as to that point; and after owning what they have said upon it, "even that God pushes on the wicked to enormous crimes, and that he is in some sort the cause of sin [‡]," his disciples think they have sufficiently justified the Reformation from these so impious expressions, by reason that "they have not been employed for more than a hundred years [§];" as if it were not a sufficient conviction of the evil spirit she was conceived in, to confess in her very authors such horrid blasphemies.

5.—*The Tenets which Calvin and Beza superadded to those of Luther.*

Such, therefore, was the fatality which Calvin and Beza taught after Luther; and thereto the aforesaid dogmata were added by them regarding the certainty of Salvation and the inamissibility of justice [||]. As much as to say, true justifying faith could never be lost: those that have it are surely assured of having it, and thereby are not only assured of their present justice, as spoke the Lutherans, but also of their eternal salvation, and this with an absolute and infallible certainty: assured, by consequence, of dying just, whatever crimes they might commit; and not only of dying just, but also of continuing so in sin itself, because without that, they could not maintain the sense given by them to this text of St. Paul, "the gifts and calling of God are without repentance *."

---

[*] Lib. de Æt. Dei prædes. opusc. 704, 705. Lib. iii. c. xxiii. n. 7, 8, 9.

[†] De prædes. de occult. provid., &c.

[‡] Jur. jugem. sur les mech. Sect. xvii. pp. 142, 143.

[§] Jur. Ibid.

[||] S. 1. ix. n. 3, et seq.

6.—*Every Believer certified of his Perseverance and Salvation: and this, in Calvinism, the chief foundation of Religion.*

This is what Beza likewise decided in the same exposition of faith, where he said, "that to the elect alone was granted the gift of faith:" that this faith, which is proper and peculiar to the elect, consists in depending with certainty, each "one for himself, on their election:" whence it follows, "that whosoever hath this gift of true faith, ought to rest assured of his perseverance." For as he says †, "What does it avail me to believe, if I be not assured (perseverance in faith being requisite) that perseverance will be given me?" Then he reckons among the fruits of this doctrine, that it alone teaches us to be assured of our faith for the time to come: which he takes to be of such importance, "that those," says he, "who oppose this, do certainly overthrow the chief foundation of the Christian religion."

7.—*This certainty of One's own particular Salvation, as great as if God himself had given it us by His own Mouth.*

Thus, this certainty, which every man hath of his own faith and perseverance, is not only a certainty of faith, but also the principal foundation of the Christian religion: and to shew that he speaks not here of a moral and conjectural certainty, Beza adds ‡, "that we have it in our power to know whether we be predestined to salvation, and to be assured of the glorification which we expect, on account of which all Satan's war is waged against us; yea, say I, assured," continues he, "not by our fancy, but by conclusions as certain as if we had ascended into heaven to hear that sentence from the mouth of God." He will not have the faithful aspire to less certainty than this: and after proposing the means of attaining to it, which he places in the certain knowledge we have of the faith that is in us, he concludes, "we thereby learn that we are given to the Son according to God's purpose and predestination: by consequence," proceeds he, "since that God is unalterable, since that perseverance in the faith is requisite to salvation, and being made certain of our predestination, glorification is annexed to it by an indissoluble hand: how can we doubt of perseverance, and finally of our salvation?"

---

* Rom. xi. 29. † Ch. viii. conc. part i. p. 66. ‡ Ib. conc. part ii. p. 121.

8.—*Calvinists begin to be sensible of these Excesses.*

As the Lutherans, no less than the Catholics, abominated these dogmata, and the writings of the first were read with a more favourable prevention by the Calvinists, the horror of these sentiments, unheard of till Calvin's days, spread itself by little and little among the Calvinian churches. Men began to awake, and perceive how horrible it was, that a true believer could not fear for his salvation in contradiction to this precept of the Apostle: "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling*." If it be a temptation and weakness to fear for one's salvation, as in Calvinism men are forced to say, why does St. Paul command this fear; and can a temptation fall within the precept?

9.—*They opposed this Fear commanded by St. Paul.*

The answer returned by them was not satisfactory. "The believer trembles," said they, "when he regards himself, because, however just he may be, he hath nothing in himself but death and damnation; and would indeed be damned, were he judged with rigour. But resting assured that he shall not be so judged, what has he to fear? the future," say they; "because should he forsake God, he would perish:" weak reasoning! since, besides their holding the condition itself impossible, they hold, moreover, that the true faithful ought to believe assuredly that they shall persevere. Thus, in all manner of ways, the fear inspired by St. Paul is banished, and salvation rendered certain.

10.—*Frivolous Evasion.*

When they answer,—without fearing for salvation, there are other chastisements enough to afford just occasion of trembling; the Catholics and Lutherans reply, that this fear mentioned by St. Paul does manifestly regard salvation: "Work out," says he, "your own salvation with fear and trembling." The Apostle inspired a terror reaching so far as to fear making shipwreck in the faith, as well as in a good conscience[*]; and Jesus Christ himself hath said, "fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell [†];" a precept which concerned the faithful as well as the rest, and made them fear no less a thing than the loss of their own souls. To these proofs they added those from experience: the idolatries, and disastrous fall of a Solomon, adorned undoubtedly at first with all the gifts of grace; the abominable crimes of a David; besides what every person is conscious of in his own regard. What, then, is it fitting that, without security against crimes, you should be secure against their penalties; and that he, who once believed himself truly faithful, should be obliged to believe that he is sure of forgiveness, let him fall into whatsoever abominations he may. But must he lose this certainty in the midst of crimes?—he must then necessarily lose the remembrance of his faith and of the grace he has received. Does he not lose it?—he must then remain as secure in crimes, as in innocence; and, provided he argue aright according to the principles of his sect, he shall find therein wherewith to condemn all whatever doubts might arise of his conversion; so that, whilst he continues to live amidst disorders, he will be sure not to die in them: or else, will be sure he never had been a true believer when he most believed himself such; and there you see him in despair, never able to hope for more certainty of his salvation than he had enjoyed then nor able, do what he will, ever to secure himself, in this life, that he shall not relapse into the deplorable state he now is in. What remedy for all this, unless to conclude, that the infallible certainty, boasted of in Calvinism, suits not with this life, and that nothing is more rash nor pernicious than such certainty.

---

* Phil. ii. 12.

11.—*Justifying Faith not forfeited by sin.*

But how much is it more so, to hold one's self assured, I do not say to recover lost grace, with true justifying faith, but not to lose them in sin itself; to remain therein still just and regenerated; to preserve therein the Holy Ghost, and the seed of life, as the Calvinists undoubtedly believe [‡], if they follow Calvin and Beza and the other chief doctors of their sect? For, according to them, justifying faith is peculiar to the sole elect, who are never deprived of it; and Beza said, in the Exposition so often quoted [§], "that faith, although it be as it were buried sometimes in the elect of God, in order to make them sensible of their infirmity, yet it never is without the fear of God, and charity for our neighbour." And a little further on*, he says two things concerning the spirit of adoption: first, "that those, who are planted in the Church only for a time, do never receive it;" second, "that those who are admitted among the people of God by this spirit of adoption, do never go forth from them."

---

[*] 1 Tim. i. 19. [†] Matt. x. 28. [‡] S. 1. ix. n. 15. [§] Ch. iv. Conc. part 13. p. 74.

12.—*What Scripture-texts Calvinists ground themselves on.*

This doctrine was grounded on these texts: "God is not like to man, so as to be a liar; nor like to the son of man, so as to repent †." Which also was the reason why St. Paul said, "That the gifts and calling of God are without repentance ‡." What then, does not man lose any of the gifts of God in adulteries, in homicides, in the blackest of crimes, not even in idolatry? And if some of them at least may be lost for a time and during this state, why should not justifying faith, and the presence of the Holy Ghost, be of this number, nothing being more incompatible with the state of sin, than such Graces?

13.—*Question proposed to the Calvinists: whether a Believer were damned that died in his crime.*

In regard to this last difficulty, a very material query was also proposed, which I beg may be attentively considered, because it will be the subject of an important dispute presently to be treated of. The Calvinist is therefore asked, whether this true believer, David for instance, fallen into adultery and murder, would be saved or damned dying in this state before he had done penance? None durst answer, he would be saved; and indeed, how can a Christian maintain that any may be saved with such crimes? This true believer would be therefore damned, dying in this state; this true believer, in this state, has therefore ceased to be just, since none will ever say of a just man, that he would be damned dying in his justice.

14.—*The Calvinists' inextricable confusion under this question.*

To answer, he shall not die in his sin, but will do penance if he be of the number of the predestinated, is saying nothing; for it is not predestination, nor the penance we shall do one day, which justifies and makes us saints; otherwise, a predestinated infidel would actually be sanctified and justified even before he had faith and repentance; since, before he had either of them, he was already certainly predestinated; God had already certainly decreed he should have them.

---

* S. l. ix. Ch. v. Conc. 6. p. 90.

† Conc. p. 74.

‡ Rom. xi. 29.

If it be answered, this infidel is not actually justified and sanctified, because he has not as yet had faith, and repentance, although he be to have them hereafter; whereas, the true believer has them already: here arises a new perplexity; for it would follow from thence, that faith and repentance, but once exercised by the faithful, justify and sanctify them actually and for ever, although ceasing to exercise them, and even abandoning them by abominable crimes: a thing more horrible to conceive than all hitherto said on this subject.

15.—*This no indifferent question.*

Again, this is no chimerical question; it is a question that every believer, when he sins, should make to himself: or rather, it is a judgment he ought to pronounce; were I to die in the state I am in, I should be damned. To add after this, but I am predestinated, and shall amend one day; and by reason of this future amendment, am, at this instant, just and holy and a living member of Christ Jesus, is utter blindness.

16.—*These difficulties were the occasion of many forsaking Calvinism.*

Whilst Catholics, and Lutherans more readily listened to than they in the new Reformation, urged home these arguments, many Calvinists were convinced; and seeing on the other hand amongst the Lutherans a more engaging doctrine, they were attracted by it *. A general will in God to save all mankind; in Jesus Christ, a sincere intention to redeem them, and means sufficient offered unto all, was what the Lutherans taught in the book of Concord. We have seen as much; we have seen even their excesses regarding these offered means and the co-operation of free-will: they gave daily more and more into these sentiments, and the Calvinists began to listen to them, principally in Holland.

17.—*Arminius's dispute and excesses.*—1601, 1602.

James Arminius, a famous minister of Amsterdam, and since Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden, was the first that declared himself in the university against the maxims received in the Churches of his country: but a man of so vehement a temper was not likely to keep within just bounds. He openly blamed Beza, Calvin, Zanchius, and the rest, whom Calvinism accounted her main pillars and support*. But he impugned excesses with other excesses; and besides his apparently drawing near to the Pelagians, was suspected, nor without reason, of something worse; certain words falling from him, made him be believed favourable to Socinianism, and a great number of his disciples turning afterwards to that side, confirmed the suspicion.

---

* S. l. viii. n. 52. Epit. c. xi. Concord. p. 621. solid. repet. 669, 805, et seq.

18.—*Gomar's opposition to him in defence of Calvinism.—Party of Remonstrants and Anti-Remonstrants.*

He met with a terrible adversary in the person of Francis Gomar, Professor of Divinity in the University of Groningen, a rigorous Calvinist, if ever there was one. The academies divided themselves between these two Professors: the division increased; the ministers espoused the quarrel; Arminius beheld whole Churches in his party. His death did not end the dispute. And the minds of men on both sides were so inflamed under the names of Remonstrants and Anti-Remonstrants, namely of Arminians and Gomarists, that the United Provinces saw themselves on the very brink of a civil war.

19.—*The Prince of Orange upholds the first, Barneveld the second Party.*

Maurice prince of Orange had his reasons for supporting the Gomarists. Barneveld, his enemy, was judged favourable to the Arminians; and the reason of it was his proposing a mutual toleration and imposing silence on both parties †.

This indeed answered the wishes of the Remonstrants. A party just shooting up, and as yet but weak, asks no more than time to gather strength: but the ministers, among whom Gomar prevailed, were determined on victory, and the prince of Orange had more skill than to let a party strike root, which he judged as opposite to his grandeur as to the primitive maxims of the Reformation.

20.—*The Remonstrants or Arminians condemned in the Provincial Synods.—Convocation of the Synod of Dort.*

The provincial Synods had done nothing but aggravate the evil by condemning the Remonstrants; it was necessary to proceed at length to a greater remedy: wherefore the States-general assembled a national Synod, and invited to it all those of their religion in every country. Upon this invitation England, Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse, the Swiss, the republics of Geneva, of Bremen, and Embden, in a word, the whole body of the Reformation not united to the Lutherans, sent deputies, with the exception of the French, whom reasons of state prevented; and of all these deputies, in conjunction with those of the whole United Provinces, was composed that famous Synod of Dort, whose doctrine and procedure we are now to relate.

---

* Act. Syn. Dordr. Edit. Dordr. 1620. Præf. ad Eccl. ante Synod. Dordr.

† Ibid.

21.—*Opening of the Synod,* 1618.

This assembly opened the 14th of November, 1618, with a sermon preached by Balthasar Lydius, minister of Dort. The first sessions were taken up in regulating divers matters of discipline, or of procedure; nor was it till the 13th of December, in the thirty-first sitting, that, properly speaking, they began to treat of doctrine.

22.—*The dispute reduced to five heads.—Declaration of the Remonstrants in general touching these five heads.*

In order to understand in what manner they proceeded there, it is necessary to know that, after many books and conferences, the dispute was at length reduced to five heads. The first regarded predestination; the second, the universality of redemption; the third and the fourth, which were always treated together, regarded the corruption of man and his conversion; the fifth regarded perseverance.

On these five heads, the Remonstrants had declared in general, in full Synod, by the mouth of Simon Episcopius, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, who always appears at their head, that men of great renown and repute in the Reformation had laid down such things as agreed neither with God's wisdom, nor with his goodness and justice, nor with the love which Jesus Christ bore to all men, nor with his satisfaction and merits, nor with the sanctity of preaching and the ministry, nor with the use of the sacraments, nor, in fine, with the duties of a Christian. These great men, whom they impeached, were the authors of the Reformation,—Calvin, Beza, Zanchius, and the others, whom they were not allowed to name, but whom they had not spared in their writings. After this general declaration of their sentiments, they explained themselves in particular as to the five articles[*]; and their declaration attacked principally the certainty of salvation, and the inamissibility of justice—tenets by which, they pretended, piety was ruined in the Reformation, and so fine a name discredited. I shall relate the substance of this declaration of the Remonstrants, in order that it may be better understood what chiefly was the subject matter of the deliberation and the result thereof, in the decisions of the Synod.

23.—*The import of the Remonstrants' declaration as to each particular.—As to Predestination.*

Concerning Predestination, they said[†]—"They ought not to own in God any absolute decree, whereby he had determined to give Jesus Christ to the elect alone, no more than to give to them alone by an efficacious vocation, faith, justification, perseverance, and glory; but that he had appointed Jesus Christ the common redeemer of the whole world, and resolved, by this decree, to justify and save all those who should believe in him, and at the same time to give to all of them sufficient means in order to be saved; that none perished through want of these means, but through the abuse thereof; that the absolute and especial election of particular persons was made in view of their faith and future perseverance, nor was there any election but conditional; and that reprobation likewise was made in view of men's infidelity and perseverance in so great an evil."

24.—*Doctrine of the Remonstrants concerning Infant Baptism, and what they would conclude from it.*

They added two points worthy of particular consideration: the first, that all children of the faithful were sanctified, and that none of them, dying before the use of reason, are damned; the second, that with much more reason none of these children dying after baptism, before the use of reason, are damned[‡].

In saying that all the children of the faithful are sanctified, they did but repeat what we have clearly seen in the Calvinian Confessions of Faith; and if they be sanctified, it is evident they cannot be damned in this state. But after this first article, the second seemed unnecessary; for if these children were secure of their salvation before baptism, after its reception there could be no question of it. It was therefore with a particular design that this second article was inserted, and the Remonstrants would thereby denote the inconstancy of the

---

[*] Sess. xxxi. p. 112. [†] Ibid. [‡] Art. ix. 10. Ibid.

Calvinists, who on one hand, to salve the baptism given to all these children, said, they were all saints, and born in the covenant, the sign whereof, by consequence, could not be refused them ; and to salve, on the other hand, the doctrine of the inamissibility of justice, they said that baptism given to children had not its effect, but in the predestinated alone ; so that the baptized that lived ill afterwards never had been saints, not even with the baptism they had received in their infancy.

Remark, I beseech the judicious reader, this important difficulty ; it strikes home to the question of inamissibility, and it will be curious to behold how the Synod will behave in this regard.

25.—*Declaration of the Remonstrants concerning the universality of Redemption.*

As to the second head, regarding the universality of redemption, the Remonstrants said*, that " the price paid by the Son of God was not only sufficient to all, but actually offered for all and every individual person ; that none were excluded from the fruit of redemption by an absolute decree, or otherwise than by their own fault ; that God, prevailed with by his Son, had made a new treaty with all mankind, although sinners and damned." They said, by this treaty he had bound himself in respect of all, to afford them those sufficient means as abovementioned : " but that the remission of sins, merited for all, was not given actually, except through actual faith, whereby man believed actually in Jesus Christ ;" by which words they gave to understand, that whosoever lost, by his crimes, actual faith which justifies us, lost also, together with it, justifying grace and sanctity ; finally, they said also, " none ought to believe Jesus Christ died for him, save only those for whom he died in effect †; insomuch that the reprobate, for whom Jesus Christ did not die, whatsoever some might think of them, ought not to believe that he died for them." This article reached much further than it seemed. For the design of it was to show (according to Calvin's and the Calvinists' doctrine, who laid down for an undoubted dogma, that Jesus Christ did not die in any sort but for the predestinated, and in no sort for the reprobate) that it followed from thence, that to be enabled to say, Jesus Christ died for me, one ought to be assured, with an absolute certainty, of his predestination and eternal happiness, without ever being able to say, "he died for me, but I have rendered his death and redemption unserviceable to me,"—a doctrine which defeats all preaching of the word to Christians, who, if bad livers, are continually told they have made themselves unworthy of being redeemed by Jesus Christ. Accordingly, this was one of those articles by which the Remonstrants maintained, that, in the Reformation, all the sincerity and holiness of preaching was subverted, as well as this text of St. Peter—"They have denied the Lord that bought them, and brought upon themselves swift perdition*."

---

* Sess. xxxiv. p. 115. et seq.

† Art. iv. Ibid.

26.—*Their doctrine as to the third and fourth head.*

Regarding the third and fourth head, after saying that grace is necessary to all good, not only to finish, but also to begin it, they added, "that efficacious grace was not irresistible†." This was their expression, and that of the Lutherans, whose doctrine they boasted of following. Their meaning was, that one might resist all kind of grace; and thereby, as every one sees, they pretended ‡, "That although grace were bestowed unequally, yet God gave or offered a sufficient grace to all those to whom the gospel was announced, even to those that were not converted; and offered it with a sincere and serious desire of saving them all without acting two different parts, seeming inclined to save, and at bottom unwilling to do it, and moving men interiorly to sins which he forbade exteriorly." In all these places they aimed directly at the authors of the Reformation, and that insincere vocation which they attributed to God, whilst he openly called those to grace whom in reality he excluded from it, predestinating them to evil.

In order to show how far grace was resistible § (these words warranted by use, must be allowed, in order to avoid circumlocution), they had inserted an article, which said "that man could do more good by the grace of the Holy Ghost than he did, and keep at a further distance from evil than he did;" he therefore frequently resisted grace, and made it useless.

27.—*Declaration of the Remonstrants concerning the Amissibility of Justice.*

Concerning perseverance, they decided ¶, that "God gave to the true faithful, regenerated by his grace, means for preserving themselves in that state; that they might lose the true justifying faith, and fall into sins incompatible with justification, even into atrocious crimes; persevere in them, die in them, recover from them likewise by repentance, nevertheless without being necessitated to it by grace." Here is what they urged with the greatest efforts, "detesting," said they, "from the bottom of their hearts those impious dogmata, and contrary to good morals, which were disseminated daily among the people; viz., that the true faithful could not fall into the sins of malice, but only into the sins of ignorance and weakness; that they could not lose grace; that all the crimes of the world put together could not frustrate their election, nor deprive them of the certainty thereof; a thing," added they, "which opened a gap to carnal and pernicious security; that no crimes, how horrible soever, were imputed to them; that all manner of sins present and to come were forgiven them beforehand; that in the midst of heresies, of adulteries, of murders, for which they might be excommunicated, they could not totally and finally lose the faith*."

---

* 2 Pet. ii. 1. † Ead. Sess. xxxiv. p. 116, et seq. ‖ Ibid. p. 117.
§ Art. vii. Ibid. p. 117. ¶ Ibid. pp. 117, 118. et seq.

28.—*Two material words which the whole dispute turned on: that one could lose grace totally and finally.*

These two words, *totally* and *finally*, were what the dispute chiefly turned upon. To lose faith and the grace of justification totally, was to lose it wholly for a certain time; to lose it finally, was to lose it for ever and beyond recovery. Both the one and the other were held impossible in Calvinism, and both of these excesses were detested by the Remonstrants.

29.—*Against the certainty of Salvation.*

They concluded the declaration of their doctrine by saying that, as the true believer might, in the time present, be assured of his faith and good conscience, he might also be assured for that time, should he then die, of his eternal salvation †; that he might also be assured of being able to persevere in the faith, forasmuch as grace would never fail him for that end: but to be assured of always doing his duty, they did not see how he "could be so, nor how this assurance could be necessary for him."

30.—*Foundations of the Remonstrants, viz., that there is no gratuitous preference for the Elect.*

If you desire now to comprehend in few words the whole of their doctrine, the foundation of it was, that there is no absolute election, no gratuitous preference, whereby God prepares for certain chosen persons, and for them only, certain means to lead them to glory; but that God offers to all men, and especially all those to whom the gospel is published, sufficient means of conversion, which some make use of, and others not, without employing any other for his elect more than for the reprobate; so that election always is conditional, which, the condition failing, may be forfeited. Whence they concluded in the first place, that we may lose justifying grace, and totally, that is, entirely; and finally, that is, beyond recovery: secondly, that man could not in any wise be sure of his salvation.

---

* Ead. Sess. xxxiv. Art. iv. Ibid. p. 118.

† Art. vii. and viii. Ibid. p. 119.

31.—*Wherein Catholics agreed with the Remonstrants.*

Although Catholics did not agree with them in the principle, they agreed with them in the two last consequences, which nevertheless they grounded on other principles, which it is not necessary to the present subject to set forth in this place; and likewise they agreed that the Calvinian doctrine, opposite to these consequences, was impious, and an inlet to all sorts of wickedness.

32.—*Wherein consisted the difference betwixt Catholics, Lutherans, and Remonstrants.*

The Lutherans also agreed on this point with the Catholics and Remonstrants. But the difference between Catholics and Lutherans is, that these latter, denying the certainty of perseverance, acknowledged a certainty of present justice, in which they were followed by the Remonstrants; whereas Catholics differed from both of them, by maintaining that none could be assured either of his future good dispositions, nor even of his present ones, which, by reason of the blindness of self-love, we have always grounds to distrust; so that the confidence we have on God's side, takes not away wholly the doubt we have on our own.

33.—*Calvinists contrary to the Doctrine of them both.*

Calvin and the Calvinists opposed the doctrine of both these, and maintained against the Lutherans and Remonstrants, that the true believer was sure, not of the present only, but also of the future, and sure, by consequence, of never losing totally, that is, entirely; nor finally, that is, beyond recovery, justifying grace or the true faith once received.

34.—*The Remonstrants demand a distict Decision.*

The state of the question and the different sentiments are well understood *; and never so little perspicuity in the Synod of Dort's decision would have made us easily comprehend what was their doctrine, which they were so much the more obliged to, as the Remonstrants, after their declaration, had summoned those that should complain of their doctrine's being ill-represented by them, to reject distinctly every particular wherein they judged themselves wrongfully accused; and entreated also the Synod to deliver themselves precisely in respect of the articles that cast such a blemish on the whole Reformation.

35.— *The Synod's decision.*

If ever there was a necessity of speaking plainly, it was after such a declaration and in such a conjuncture. Let us now give ear to the decision of the Synod.

It pronounces on the five heads proposed in four chapters, for, as above said, the third and fourth head always went together. Each chapter has two parts: in the first, they assert; in the second, reject and condemn. This is the substance of their canons, for so did they call the decrees of this Synod.

36.—*The Synod's decision on the first head.—Faith in the sole Elect: certainty of Salvation.*

Concerning predestination and election they decided, "that the decree thereof is absolute and unchangeable; that God gives true and lively faith to all those he resolves to withdraw from common damnation, *and to them only:* that this faith is a gift of God; that all the elect, in their time, are assured of their election, albeit not in the same degree nor in equal measure; that this assurance is derived to them, not from the fathoming of God's secrets, but from observing in themselves, with a holy pleasure and spiritual joy, the infallible fruits of election, such as be true faith, sorrow for their sins, and the like; that the sense and certainty of their salvation always make them better; that those, who have not as yet this sense and this certain confidence, ought to desire it; and, lastly, that this doctrine should not affright any but those who, wedded to the world, are not seriously converted †." Here have we already for the sole elect, together with true faith, the certainty of salvation; but the thing will unfold itself hereafter much more clearly.

---

* Sess. xxxiv. Ibid. pp. 121, 322.

† Sess. xxxvi. p. 249, et seq. Ib. Art. xii. et seq. p. 251.

37.—*Decision on Infant Baptism.*

The seventeenth article decides *, "that the word of God declaring holy the children of the faithful, not by nature, but by the covenant wherein they are comprised together with their parents, the believing parents ought not to doubt of the election and salvation of their children that die in this infant age."

In this article the Synod approves the doctrine of the Remonstrants, whom we have heard say precisely the same thing †: nothing, therefore, is more unquestionable amongst our adversaries, than an article which we see equally taught by both parties; the sequel will manifest to us what are its consequences.

38.—*Condemnation of those that denied the certainty of Salvation.*

Amongst the rejected articles, we find that which asserts that "the certainty of salvation depends on an uncertain condition ‡;" that is to say, they condemn those who teach that one is sure of being saved by persevering to live well, but one is not sure of living well; which precisely is the doctrine we have heard the Remonstrants teach. The Synod declares this "uncertain certainty" absurd; and, by consequence, establishes an absolute certainty, which it endeavours even to prove from Scripture: but proofs are not our present purpose; it is to see this doctrine well asserted, viz., that the true believer, according to the decrees of Dort, not only ought to be sure of his salvation, supposing he does his duty well, but also ought to be sure of doing it well, at least, at the end of his life. But this is nothing as yet, and we shall see this doctrine decided much more clearly.

39.—*Justifying Faith again confessed in the sole Elect.*

Concerning Redemption and the Promise of Grace, they define, "that it is announced indifferently to all people; that it is through their own fault that those who believe it not do reject it, and through grace, that the true faithful do embrace it; but they are the elect only to whom God is resolved to give justifying faith, whereby they infallibly are saved." Here then, a second time, have we justifying faith in the elect alone: we must see afterwards what those shall have who do not continue to believe unto the end.

---

* Sess. xxxvi. Art. xvii. p. 252.

† Sup. n. 23.

‡ Ibid. Art. viii. p. 254.

40.—*Co-operation, how admitted.*

The summary of the Fourth Chapter is, that although God calls seriously all those to whom the Gospel is proclaimed, so that if they perish it is not God's fault; something nevertheless particular is wrought in those that are converted, God calling them efficaciously, and giving to them faith and repentance. The sufficient grace of the Arminians, whereby " Free-will determines itself," is rejected as a Pelagian tenet*. Regeneration is represented as transacted " without us," not by " the exterior word, or by moral persuasion," but by an operation leaving it not " in the power of man to be *regenerated or not*," to be converted, or not converted; and nevertheless, say they in this article, " when the will is renewed, it is not only pushed on and moved by God, but acts, being moved by him, and it is man that believes and repents."

41.—*The Believer's certainty.*

The will therefore does not act but when converted and renewed. What then, does it not act when one begins to desire his conversion, and to pray for the grace of regeneration? Or had you it already, when you began to pray for it? This they ought to have explained, and not say in general, Conversion and Regeneration is wrought " without us." Many other things might be said in this place, but our business is not disputing, it is sufficient we make the doctrine of the Synod historically well understood.

It says, in the thirteenth article, that the manner whereby this operation of regenerating grace is wrought in us is inconceivable; it is sufficient to conceive that by this grace the believer " knows and feels that he believes and loves his Saviour." He " knows and feels;" here have you what is most certain within the compass of perception, to know and feel.

42.—*Sequel of the same subject.*

We read in the sixteenth article †, that as sin hath not robbed man of his nature, nor of his understanding, nor of his will; so regenerating grace acts not in him " as in a stump or log of wood;" it preserves to the will " its properties, and does not force it in spite of itself;" that is, it does not make it "will without willing." What strange theology! Are not men resolved to puzzle every thing, who thus weakly express themselves on free-will?

---

* Art. xii. p. 265.

† Ibid.

43.—*Habits infused.*

Amongst the rejected errors, I find that which teaches*, "that in the true conversion of man, God cannot communicate qualities, habits, and gifts by infusion, and that faith by which we are first converted, and from which we are called faithful, is not a gift and quality by God infused, but only an act of man." I am glad to hear the infusion of these new qualities and habits; it will be of great service to us in order to explain the true idea of justification, and to shew by what means it may be obtained of God. For I do not believe it can be doubted but that, in those who are come to the age of understanding, it is an act of faith inspired by God which obtains for us the grace to receive the habit of it, with that of other virtues. Yet the infusion of this habit will be nevertheless gratuitons, as will be seen in due time. But let us proceed, and come now to the last chapter, which is the most material, because the reproaches of the Remonstrants concerning the certainty of salvation and the inamissibility of justice were there to be answered fully and distinctly.

44.—*Justice not to be lost.—Monstrous doctrine of the Synod.*

Concerning Inamissibility, this is what they say†, *viz.*, "That in certain particular actions the true faithful may sometimes withdraw themselves, and do so in effect, by their vices, from the guidance of grace, to follow concupiscence, even so far as to fall into atrocious crimes; and do, by these enormous sins, offend God, render themselves guilty of death, interrupt the exercise of faith, greatly wound their consciences, and *sometimes* lose, for a while, *the sense of grace*." O God, is it possible, in this detestable state, they should only "lose *the sense of grace*," and not grace itself, and this, too, but "*sometimes*‡!" But it is not yet time to exclaim; here is much worse: "God, in those dismal falls, does not *entirely* deprive them of his holy Spirit, nor suffers them to fall so as to *forfeit the grace of adoption and the state of justification*, nor so as to commit the sin unto death, nor against the Holy Ghost, and be damned." Whosoever therefore is once truly faithful, and regenerated by grace, not only shall not perish in his crimes, but at the very time he abandons himself to them, "*does not fall from the grace of adoption, and the state of justification.*" Could Jesus Christ be associated with Belial, grace with sin, in a more flagrant manner?

---

* Art. vi. p. 267. † Ibid. iv. v. p. 271. ‡ Ibid. vi. et seq.

45.—*What is the sin a true Believer cannot fall into.*

The Synod, indeed, seems willing to preserve the faithful from some crimes, when it says, "they are not so far abandoned as to fall into the sin unto death, or against the Holy Ghost," which the Scripture says is not to be forgiven; but if they understand any other sin by this, than that of final impenitence, I am at a loss to know what it can be, there being no such sinner, what disorders soever he may have been guilty of, that should not be made to hope the forgiveness of them. Let us, however, leave to the Synod to determine what other explanation of this sin it may please to fancy; it is sufficient we see plainly, according to its doctrine, that all crimes possible to be named, for example, an adultery as long continued, and a murder as much premeditated as that of David's, heresy, idolatry, even with all its abominations, which the Synod evidently allows the true believer may fall into, are compatible "with the grace of adoption and the state of justification."

45.—*The Synod speaks plainly.*

Nor can it be said by this state the Synod understands only the right of salvation still remaining in the true believer, namely, according to the Synod, in the predestinated, in virtue of predestination; for, on the contrary, the matter here in deliberation concerns the immediate right one has to salvation by actual regeneration and conversion, and concerns the state whereby one is, I do not say destined to, but really in possession as well of the true faith as of justification. In a word, the matter in debate is not whether you shall one day have this grace, but whether, after having had it, you can forfeit it one single moment; the Synod decides you cannot. Remonstrants, complain not, you have your answer, at least, in plain terms as you desired, and all the pernicious doctrine you say is believed in the party which you accuse, all that you reject therein with abhorrence is decided by them in express terms.

47.—*The great words "totally" and "finally."*

But, to remove all equivocation, we must see in the Synod * these essential words, "totally" and "finally," whereon, I have shewn, the whole dispute depended. We must see, I say, whether it allows the Remonstrants to assert, that a true believer "may fall totally and finally from the state of justification." The Synod, to leave no doubt of its sentiment as opposite to the total loss, says, "that the immortal seed, whereby the true faithful are regenerated, abides always in them in spite of their fall." As opposite to the final loss, the same Synod says†, that the reconciled, one day, "*shall feel* grace anew;" they shall not recover it; no, the Synod is sure not to say that, "they shall feel it" anew. In this manner, proceeds the Synod, it happens that "neither do they lose *totally* the faith and grace, nor do they remain *finally* in their sin, so as to perish in it."

Here, methinks, is enough said for inamissibility. Let us see as to certainty.

48.—*Certainty of salvation, of what kind?*

"The true faithful," says the Synod ‡, "may be certain, and are so, of their salvation and perseverance, according to the measure of faith wherewith they *believe with certainty* that they are, and abide, living members of the Church; that they have forgiveness of their sins, and life eternal: a certainty which does not accrue to them from a particular revelation, but from faith in the promises which God hath revealed in his word, and by the testimony of the Holy Ghost, and lastly, by a good conscience, and a holy and serious application to good works."

49.—*All uncertainty a temptation.*

To leave nothing unsaid, it adds §, "that in the temptations and doubts of the flesh, which we are to contrast with, we do not always feel this fulness of faith and this certainty of perseverance:" to the end that, as often as ever you feel some doubt, and dare not promise yourself with an entire certainty to persevere always in your duty, you may look on yourself obliged to reckon this doubt among the motions of the flesh, and the temptations you are to fight against.

---

* S. n. 27.

† Art. vii. viii. p. 272.

‡ Ib. Art. ix. pp. 272, 273.

§ Ib. Art. ii.

50.—*Totally and finally.*

Amongst the rejected errors this afterwards is reckoned [*], *viz.* "that the true faithful may fall, and do often fall, *totally and finally* from justifying faith, from grace and salvation, and that, during this life, you cannot have any security of future perseverance without special revelation." They declare this doctrine brings back the doubts of Papists, because this certainty, without special revelation, was condemned in the Council of Trent.

51.—*How man justified remains guilty of death.*

It may be asked, how they reconcile with the doctrine of Inamissibility, that which is said in the Synod [†], *viz.* that by great crimes, the faithful committing them, "render themselves guilty of death." This is what easily is brought to bear with the principles of the new Reformation, where it is maintained that the true believer, how much soever regenerated, remains always, by concupiscence, "guilty of death," not only in his great and less sins, but also in his good works; so that this state, rendering us guilty of death, is no hindrance, according to the terms of the Synod, to our abiding in the "state of justification and grace."

52.—*The self-contradiction of the Calvinian Doctrine.*

But then, have we not said that our Reformed could not deny, nor in effect did deny, but that, should one die in these crimes without doing penance, he would be damned? True it is, the greatest part confess it; and although the Synod decided nothing in body concerning this difficulty, it was proposed there, as we shall see, by some of the Opiners. In good truth, it is wondrous strange men can remain in an error containing so inevitable and manifest a contradiction as that is which acknowledges a state of grace, in which, nevertheless, one would be damned should he die therein. But many other contradictions are there in this doctrine: here is one unquestionably not less palpable than the other. In the new Reformation, true faith is inseparable from the love of God and good works, the necessary fruits thereof: it is the most steady dogma of this religion; and here you see, nevertheless, in opposition to this dogma, true faith, not only without good works, but also in the greatest crimes. Have patience, this is not all: I see another contradiction not less manifest in the new Reformation, even by the Synod's own decree*: All children of the faithful are holy, and their salvation certain. Therefore, in this state, they are truly justified: therefore they cannot fall from grace, and every individual of the Reformation will be predestinated: nor can one believer, which is still more strange, have a child that is not holy and predestinated like himself: thus all their posterity are evidently predestinated, and never can a reprobate spring from one elect. Who of them all will dare to say it? And yet, who of them can deny, that so visible and so strange an absurdity is clearly contained in the principles of the Synod and the doctrine of Inamissibility? It is therefore all over teeming with manifest absurdities, all over jarring with horrid contradictions; nor can it indeed be otherwise than the necessary result of error thus always to contradict itself.

---

[*] Art. iii. p. 274. Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. c. xii. Can. xvi.

[†] S. n. 42.

53.—*All error contradicts itself.*

There is no error but must fall into self-contradiction some way or other: but see what befalls man possessed with strong prejudice. He first strives, what he can, to avoid seeing this inevitable and glaring contradiction: if this cannot be done, he looks on it with a prepossession, that does not allow him to form a right judgment of it; he thinks to fence against it by soothing himself with frothy reasoning and fine words: dazzled with some specious principle to which he is strongly wedded, he is resolved never to forsake it. Eutyches and his followers durst not say, Jesus Christ was not at the same time true God and true man: but fond of that unity ill-understood, which they imagined in Jesus Christ, they would have both natures confounded in this union, and were pleased and gloried in removing by this means to a greater distance than all others (though it were even to excess) from Nestorius's heresy which divided the Son of God. Thus do men entangle, thus do they prepossess themselves, thus do the prepossessed, with blind determination, lead the van and draw after them the giddy vulgar, without being willing, or able to understand, as says the Apostle†, "either what they say themselves, or whereof they affirm" with such assurance. This is what constitutes all opinionists; this is the pit all heretics fall into.

---

* S. n. 36.

† 1 Tim. i. 7.

54.—*Certainty of salvation, a false allurement.*

Our adversaries frame to themselves an object of infinite comfort in the certainty they will needs be in of their eternal salvation. Do not expect they ever will regard, with candid equity or attention, what may deprive them of this certainty. If to maintain it they must be obliged to say, one is sure not to die in sin though he fall into it with malice propense, nay, though he contract a detestable habit thereof; this they will say. If they must exaggerate, beyond measure, this text of St. Paul *, "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance," and say, God never takes away entirely, nor in substance, what he has given; this they will say happen what will, whatever contradictions you may shew them, whatever inconsistency, what dismal consequence soever may result from their doctrine: otherwise, besides losing the pleasure of their certainty and the charms discovered by them in the novelty of this tenet, they must also be forced to own that they were in the wrong as to the point they looked upon the most essential of their Reformation, and the church of Rome, so much censured and hated by them, was in the right.

55.—*Whether the Synod were ill-understood in respect to Inamissibility, and whether the Certainty it proposes be no more than confidence.*

But, perchance, this certainty, which they teach, is nothing else at bottom than that trust which we admit. Would to God it were! Nobody denies this trust: the Lutherans maintained it, yet the Calvinists told them a hundred times, that something more was requisite. But without going forth from the Synod, the Arminians admitted this trust; for unquestionably they never said that a believer fallen into sin, which he repents of, should despair of his salvation. The Synod nevertheless condemns them, because that, satisfied with this hope, they reject certainty. The Catholics in fine admitted this trust, and the holy perseverance, which the Council of Trent † will have us acknowledge as God's special gift, it will have us expect with confidence from his infinite bounty: and yet, because it rejects absolute certainty ‡, the Synod condemns it, and accuses the Remonstrants, who likewise condemned this certainty, of falling by this means into the doubts of Popery. Had the dogma of absolute certainty and inamissibility raised as much horror in the Synod as so hideous a doctrine should excite naturally in all minds, the ministers that composed this assembly would not have had mouths enough to proclaim throughout all the universe, that the Remonstrants, the Lutherans, and the Catholics, laying such a blasphemy to their charge, did calumniate them; and all Europe would have rung with their clamour: but on the contrary, so far were they from defending themselves against this certainty and inamissibility objected to them by the Remonstrants, that they define it expressly, and condemn the Remonstrants for denying it. When they think themselves calumniated, they are not at all sparing of their complaints. They complain, for instance, at the close of their Synod *, that their enemies, and amongst the rest, the Remonstrants accuse them "of making God the author of sin; and of the reprobation of men without any regard to sin: of making him precipitate the children of the faithful into damnation, so as that all the prayers of the Church, and even baptism itself, are not able to withdraw them from it." Why do not they complain, in like manner, they are wrongfully accused of admitting this same certainty and inamissibility. "It is true," they say in this very place †," they are accused of inspiring men with carnal security, by affirming that no crime prejudices the salvation of the elect, and that they may, with full security, commit the most execrable." But is this a sufficient explanation from men that were asked a plain and direct answer? What, does it not suffice them then for an evasion, that they acknowledged crimes, for instance, "the sin even unto death and against the Holy Ghost," whatever it may be, which the elect and true faithful never fall into? And if it was their sentiment that other crimes were equally incompatible with true faith and the state of grace, could they not have said as much in express terms, whereas, in express terms, they assert the contrary?

---

* Rom. xi. 29. † Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. ‡ Can. xv. xvi. xxii.

56.—*Calvin's Doctrine expressly defined by the Synod.*

Conclude we, therefore, that, of the three articles wherein we have made the Calvinian justification to consist, the two first which already were insinuated in the Confessions of Faith, namely, absolute certainty of predestination, and the impossibility of forfeiting finally faith and grace once received, are expressly defined in the synod of Dort; and that the third article, where the question is, whether a true believer may at least lose for a while, and during his continuance in sin, justifying grace and true faith, although not expressed in any confession of faith, is likewise decided conformably to Calvin's doctrine and the spirit of the new reformation *

---

* Syn. Dord. Concl. Sess. 136. p. 275.

† Ibid.

57.—*Peter de Moulin's Sentiments approved by the Synod.*

One may also know the sentiment of the whole Synod by that of the renowned Peter du Moulin, minister of Paris; allowed by all the world to be unquestionably the most rigorous Calvinist of his time, and the most wedded to the doctrine Gomar defended against Arminius. He sent to Dort his judgment on this matter, which was read and approved by the whole Synod, and inserted in the acts. He declares, that he had not leisure to handle all the questions †: but lays down the whole substance of the Synod's doctrine when he decides, that none is justified but he that is glorified: whereby he condemns the Arminians, in that they teach ‡, "there are men justified that lose the faith, and are damned." And still more clearly in these words §: "Although the doubt of salvation enter sometimes into the minds of the true faithful, God nevertheless commands us in his word to have a certainty thereof, and we must tend with all our might to this certainty, at which we should not doubt many do arrive; and whoever is assured of his salvation, is so, at the same time, that God will never abandon him, and that he shall thus persevere even to the end." One cannot more clearly regard doubting as a temptation and weakness, nor certainty, as enjoined by God's commandment. Thus the faithful are not assured that they shall not fall into the worst of crimes, and continue in them a long while, like David: but are nevertheless assured, "God never will abandon them, and that they shall persevere even to the end." This is an abridgment of the Synod: accordingly, it was resolved by the assembly to return Du Moulin thanks for the very accurate judgment passed by him on this subject, and for his assent to the doctrine of the Synod.

58.—*Question whether the certainty of Salvation be a certainty of Faith.*

Some would doubt whether this certainty required by the Synod in every believer for his salvation, be a certainty of faith:

---

* S. l. ix. n. 2, 3, et seq. Conf. de Foi de Fr. Art. xviii. xix. xx. xxi. xxii. Dim. 18, 19, 36. S. l. ix. Conf. Bilg. Art. xxiv. Synt. Gen. part i. p. 139.

† Sess. ciii. civ. pp. 289, 300. ‡ Ibid. p. 291. § Ibid. 300.

but their doubt will cease, if they do but observe, that the certainty in question, is always expressed by the word "Believe," which in the Synod is taken no otherwise than for true faith; to which add, that this certainty, according to the same Synod, is nothing else than the belief of the promises applied by each individual to himself and to his eternal salvation, with a certain feeling in the heart of the sincerity of his faith; so that, to the end no kind of certainty may be wanting, you have that of faith joined to that of experience and feeling.

59.—*The Sentiment of the Divines of Great Britain.*

Of all the Opiners, those that best explain the sense of the Synod, are the Divines of Great Britain: for after confessing, with all the rest, a kind of doubt in the believer concerning his salvation, but a doubt that always proceeds from temptation, they explain very clearly*, "how that after the temptation, the act whereby one believes that God looks upon him with the eyes of mercy, and that he shall infallibly possess eternal life, is not an act of dubious opinion, or of conjectural hope, wherein one might be deceived, *cui falsum subesse potest;* but an act of a true and lively faith excited and sealed in our hearts by the spirit of adoption:" wherein these Divines seem to advance further than the English Confession of Faith, which, as we have already seen, looks as if it designed to avoid speaking so clearly "on the certainty of salvation †."

60.—*These Divines believed that Justice could not be forfeited.—Contradiction of their Doctrine.*

Some have thought that these English Divines were not of the common opinion in respect to justice attributed to the faithful fallen into grievous crimes whilst they continue in them like to David; and what may occasion this doubt is, that these doctors decide formally, "that these faithful are in the state of damnation, and would be damned, should they die therein ‡:" whence it follows, that they are fallen from the grace of justification, at least for that time. But this is one of those places which involve all such as err in necessary contradictions: for these Divines see themselves obliged, by their erroneous principles, to acknowledge, on one side, that the faithful, thus plunged into crimes, would be damned should they then die; and on the other, "that they do not fall from the state of justification[*]."

---

* Theolog. Mag. Brit. c. de persev. cert. quoad nos. Th. iii. p. 218. Ibid. Th. iv. p. 219.

† Conf. Ang. Art. xvii. Synt. Gen. i. p. 102. S. l. x. n. 23.

‡ Theol. Mag. Brit. Th. iii. iv.

61.—*That Faith and Charity subsist amidst the greatest Crimes.*

Nor must one persuade himself, they here confound justification with predestination: for, on the contrary, it is what they distinguish most expressly; and say[†], that these faithful, plunged into crimes, not only are not fallen from their predestination, which is true of all the elect, but, "they are not fallen from the faith, nor from that celestial seed of regeneration and those fundamental gifts, without which, spiritual life can in no wise subsist[‡]; insomuch, that it is impossible the gifts of charity and faith should entirely be extinguished in their hearts. They do not entirely lose the faith, sanctity, adoption[§]: they abide in this universal justification, which is justification in its most proper sense, which no particular crime can exclude them from: they abide in this justification, from which interior renovation and sanctification are inseparable[||];" in a word, they are saints, who, if they died, would be damned.

62.—*What it was that remained in the Faithful guilty of grievous crimes.—The Doctrine of those of Embden.*

They were extremely puzzled to explain, according to these principles, what it was that remained in the faithful who had run themselves into criminal disorders. Those of Embden were agreed[¶], "actual faith could not remain in them, and that it was inconsistent with the consent to grievous sins." What they did not lose, "was habitual faith, that," said they, "which subsists in man whilst he sleeps, or doth not act:" but then, "this habitual faith infused into man by preaching and the use of the sacraments, is the true living and justifying faith;" whence they concluded that the faithful did not, for all these enormous crimes, lose "either justice or the Holy Ghost:" and when they were asked whether it might not as well be said, they lost "faith and the Holy Ghost" afterwards to recover them, as to say, they only lost "the feeling and energy" thereof[**]; they answered, the faithful ought not to be deprived of the comfort accruing to them from the impossibility of their ever losing "either faith or the Holy Ghost, what crime soever they fell into against their conscience." "For this," said they, "would be but a cold comfort, to tell them, you have entirely lost faith and the Holy Ghost, yet, perchance, God will adopt and regenerate you again, that you may be reconciled to him." Thus, what sins soever the believer may give himself up to, contrary to his conscience, they are so favourable to him, that to comfort him, they are not satisfied with leaving him the hopes of a future return to the state of grace [*]; but he must also have the comfort of actually being in it, his crimes notwithstanding.

---

[*] Theol. Mag. Brit. Th. ii. p. 212. [†] Ib. Th. v. p. 213. vi. 214. [‡] Ib. 215.
[§] Ibid. Th. vii. Ibid. Th. vi. [||] Ibid. pp. 214, 218.
[¶] Jud. Theo. Embd. de V. Art. Th. i. n. 44, 52, pp. 266, 267. Ibid. n. 45. Ibid. 270.
[**] Ibid. n. 50, 51.

63.—*What it was the Holy Ghost did in the Faithful guilty of grievous sins.—Strange idea of Christian justice.*

The question still remains, what did faith and the Holy Ghost in these believers thus abandoned to sin, and whether or no they were altogether without action in them? It was answered, they were not without action; and the effect produced by them, for example in David, was, that he did not sin "whole and entire: *Peccavit David, at non totus* [†];" there being a certain sin which he did not commit. But if you urged so far as to ask, what could be "this sin the whole man falls into," and the faithful are never guilty of? they answered [‡], "it was not a particular fall of the Christian man into such or such a crime against the first or second table, but a total and universal defection and apostacy from the Gospel truth, whereby man offends not God in part and by halves, but, by an obstinate contempt, despises his whole majesty, and absolutely excludes himself from grace." Thus, till you are arrived to this obstinate contempt of God, and to this universal apostacy, you still have the "comfort of being holy, of being justified, and regenerated," and of having the Holy Ghost dwelling in you.

64.—*The Opinion of those of Bremen.*

Corresponding to this is the sentiment of Bremen, when they say [||], "that those who are once truly regenerated, never wander to that degree as to stray entirely from God by an universal apostacy, so as to hate him as their enemy, to sin like the Devil with a studied malice, and to deprive themselves of heavenly gifts: wherefore they never lose absolutely God's grace and favour;" so that they remain in this grace and favour, well regenerated, well justified, provided only they be not the declared enemies of God, and quite as wicked as the Devil.

---

[*] Jud. Theo. Embd. de V. Art. Th. i. n. 30. p. 265. [†] Ibid. n. 54. p. 267.
[‡] Ibid. n. 60. p. 268.
[||] Jud. Brem. de V. Art. n. 32, 33. pp. 254, 255.

65.—*Whether the Synod can be excused from these excesses.—The unanimous consent of all the Opiners.*

So great are these excesses, that the Protestants are confounded at them; nay, there have been some Catholics that could not persuade themselves the Synod was guilty of them. Nevertheless, here have you historically, with the decrees of the Synod, the votes of the principal Opiners *. And that there might be no doubt, in respect to those of all the rest, besides what is inserted in the Acts of the Synod, that every thing was there decided by the unanimous consent of all the voices, not one excepted, I have expressly related the opinions, wherein those that are willing to excuse the Synod of Dort find the greatest moderation.

66.—*The Sanctification of all baptized Children confessed in the Synod, and the consequence of this doctrine.*

Besides these important points, we see a fourth expressly decided in the Synod; and it is that of the sanctity of all children descending from the faithful. There have been different explanations of this article in the Acts of the new Reformation. We have seen this sanctity of children formally established in the Catechism of the Calvinists of France, and there it is said expressly, that all children of the faithful are sanctified, and born in the Covenant; yet, we have seen the contrary in the agreement of those of Geneva with the Swiss, and the sanctification of infants, even baptized, is there restrained to the predestinated alone. Beza seems to have followed this restriction in the above-cited exposition: but the Synod of Dort pronounces in favour of the sanctity of all children born of faithful parents, and permits not the parents to doubt of their salvation; an article from which we have seen it follow demonstratively, according to the principles of the Synod, that all the children of the faithful, and all the posterity of these children to the end of time, should their race continue so long, are of the number of the predestinated †.

---

* Sess. cxxv. cxxx. et præf. ad Ecc.

† S. l. ix. pp. 11, 12, 19. Ibid. 21. Expos. de la Foi, ch. iv. Conc. xiii. p. 80. Sessione xxxvi. Ca. de prædest. Art. xvii. Sup. n. 36.

67.—*Procedure of the Synod.—The Remonstrants' petition, complaining that they are judged by their Adversaries.*

Whether all these decisions, which seem so authentic, be so certainly fundamental in the new Reformation, as to deprive of salvation and cut off from the Church all those that reject them, is what we are to examine by setting forth the procedure of the Council.

The first thing I observe therein, is a petition preferred by the Remonstrants, representing to the Synod * that they have been condemned, treated as Heretics, and excommunicated by the Anti-Remonstrants, their colleagues and parties; that they are pastors like the rest, and so naturally ought to have a seat in the Synod together with them: if they are to be excluded from it as parties in the cause, their plaintiffs ought to be excluded from it no less than they—otherwise, they would be both judges and parties at the same time, which of all procedures is the most unjust.

68.—*They employ the same arguments which the whole Protestant party insisted on against the Church.*

These were manifestly the same reasons for which all the Protestants had excepted against the Council of the Catholics; for which the Zuinglians in particular had opposed the Synod of the Ubiquitarians, by whom they were condemned at Jena, as above seen. The Remonstrants did not fail to quote these examples. They instanced chiefly in complaints made against the Council of Trent, when all Protestants exclaimed †, "We will have a free Council; a Council we may be present at together with the rest; a Council that comes unbiassed; a Council that does not hold us for Heretics—otherwise we should be judged by our adversaries." We have seen that Calvin and the Calvinists alleged the same reasons against the Synod of Jena. The Remonstrants found themselves in this very state when they beheld Francis Gomar and his adherents seated in the Council amongst their Judges, yet themselves excluded, and treated as guilty persons ‡: this was prejudging against them before examining the cause; and these reasons seemed to them so much the more convincing, as they were visibly the very same their fathers had urged against the Council of Trent, as they set forth in their petition.

---

* Sess. xxv. p. 65. et seq. † S. l. viii. n. 41. Ibid. 70. 81.

‡ Syn. Dord. Ibid. pp. 70, 71, 72, &c. 81, &c.

69.—*Their mouths are stopped by the authority of the States.*

After their petition was read, it was declared to them, "the Synod thought it very strange that the accused should set laws to their Judges, and prescribe them rules; which was not only injuring the Synod, but also the States-General, by whom it was assembled and authorized to judge; wherefore they had no more to do but obey *."

This was stopping their mouths with the authority of the secular power, but not answering their arguments, nor the example of their forefathers when they declined the judgment of the Council of Trent. And truly, little did they dwell on these considerations: the Delegates of the States who were present at the Synod † with the whole authority of their superiors, judged the Remonstrants were not to be admitted plaintiffs, and ordered them to obey the regulations of the Synod—which, on its side, declared their propositions insolent, and their challenging the whole Synod as a party in the cause, injurious, not only to the Synod itself, but also to the supreme authority of the States-General.

70.—*They protest against the Synod.—The arguments used against them by the Synod condemn the whole Protestant party.*

The Remonstrants condemned, change their petitions into protests against the Synod. These were debated on; and as the reasons alleged by them were the same with those the Protestants had used to elude the authority of the Catholic bishops, the answers returned them were the same that the Catholics had employed against the Protestants ‡. They were told that it had never been the custom of the Church to deprive pastors of their right of suffrage against errors, because that they had opposed them: that this would be divesting them of the prerogatives of their function for having faithfully discharged their duty, and subverting the whole economy of Church judgments: that by the same reasons the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians might have excepted against the whole Church, and left themselves no judge among Christians: that this would be the way to silence pastors and give a free scope to all kind of heresies. After all, what judges would they have? Where could they find, in the whole body of the pastors, these neutral and indifferent persons that had interested themselves no way in questions of faith and affairs of the Church? These arguments were unanswerable; but then, unluckily for our Reformed, they were the same that had been objected to them when they declined the judgment of the bishops in possession of authority, at the time of their separation.

---

* Syn. Dord. p. 80. Sess. xxvi. pp. 82, 83. † Sess. xxvi. p. 81.
‡ Sess. xxvii. p. 93. Ibid. n. 83, 87, 97, 98, 100, 104, 106.

71.—*They decide that the weaker and younger party ought to yield to the greater and more ancient.*

What carried the greatest weight in the objections against the Remonstrants was, "that they were innovators, and the least party, as well as the newest, which by consequence ought to be judged by the greatest, and the most ancient; by that which was in possession, and which maintained the doctrine till then received*." But thereby the Catholics did most evidently gain their cause, for, after all, what antiquity did the Dutch Reformed Church allege against the Remonstrants? We will not suffer, said she†, any alteration to be made in the doctrine we have constantly taught "these fifty years past," for this was the utmost antiquity they could boast. If fifty years gave to this Church, that called herself reformed, so great a power against the Arminians newly crept out of her bosom, what ought to be the authority of the whole Catholic Church, of so many ages standing?

72.—*The Synod's perplexity at the Protest of the Remonstrants.*

Among all the answers made to the Remonstrants, in relation to their Protest, what was the least taken notice of was the comparison made by them between their exceptions against the Synod of Dort, and those of the Reformed against the Councils of the Catholics and those of the Lutherans ‡. Some of them said, "there was a great difference between this, and the councils of Papists and Lutherans. There you hear men, the Pope and Luther; here you here God. There men are prepossessed; here not a man to be found that is not ready to yield to the word of God. There you have enemies to contend with; and here, none but brethren. There every thing is forced; here all is free." This was solving the question by that which caused the difficulty. The question was, whether the Gomarists did not come to the Synod prepossessed; the question was, whether they were enemies or brethren; the question was, which of them had the most docile hearts in regard to truth and the word of God; whether the Protestants in general, or the Catholics, the disciples of Zuinglius or those of Luther; the Gomarists or the Arminians. And as to liberty, the authority of the States which everywhere interposed, and moreover was always in the mouth of the Synod *, that of the Prince of Orange, the declared enemy of the Arminians, the imprisonment of Grotius and the other heads of that party, and lastly, the capital punishment of Barneveld, sufficiently prove what liberty was allowed in Holland as to that matter.

---

* Sess. xxvii. pp. 97, 103, &c. † Præf. ad Ecc. Ant. Syn. Dord. ‡ P. 99.

73.—*Strange answer of those of Geneva.*

The deputies of Geneva made fewer words of the difficulty, and without stopping at the Lutherans, to whom but four years of seniority above the Zuinglians could give but little authority to be their judges, they answer in respect of the Catholics †: "Our fathers might, as they pleased, protest against the Councils of Constance and Trent, because we are determined to have no kind of union with them; on the contrary, we despise and hate them: in all times those who declined the authority of Councils separated from their communion." This is the whole of their answer; and these great doctors would have had nothing to oppose against the exceptions of the Arminians, had they but broken off from the Churches of Holland, and openly "despised" and "hated" them.

74.—*According to the Synod of Dort, the Protestants were obliged to own the Council of the Catholic Church.*

According to this way of answering, the Lutherans needed not have taken so much pains to heap up grievances against the Council of Trent, nor to have discussed which was party, and which was not, in this cause. To reject the authority of the Council the Catholics cited them to, they had no more to do but say downright, We are determined to break with you, we despise you, we hate you, we trouble not ourselves about your Council. But public edification, and the very name of a Christian, would not suffer such an answer. Neither did the Lutherans answer in this manner ‡; on the contrary, they declared, and even at Augsburg in their own Confession §, that they appealed to the Council, even that Council which the Pope was to assemble. There is a like declaration in the

---

* Sess. xxv. 80. xxvi. 81, 82, 83, &c.

† Ibid. 103.

‡ S. l. iii. n. 62.

§ Conf. Argent. Peror. Synt. Gen. part i. p. 199.

Confession of Strasburg; so that both Protestant parties were agreed in this point. They were not for breaking with us; they did not hate us; they did not despise us to that degree as did those of Geneva. If it be therefore true, according to them, that the Remonstrants ought to have submitted themselves to the Council of the Reformation, as they were averse to schism; so the Protestants, who alike declared they would not separate from the Catholic Church, ought to have submitted to her Council.

75.—*In order to silence the Remonstrants, a Synod of Calvinists is forced to have recourse to the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to Councils.*

We must not forget the answer made by a whole Synod of the Province of Holland to the exceptions of the Remonstrants: it was the Synod held at Delft, a little before that of Dort. The Remonstrants objected that the Synod, which was to be convened against them, would not be infallible like that of the Apostles, and, consequently, would not bind their consciences. This they must certainly have owned, or denied all the principles of the Reformation; yet after owning it, those of Delft had these words*: "Jesus Christ, who promised the Apostles the spirit of truth, whose lights were to lead them into all truth, had likewise promised to his church to be with her even to the end of the world, and to be in the midst of two or three that should meet together in his name;" whence they concluded a little after, "that when pastors should meet together from sundry countries, in order to decide, according to God's word, what ought to be taught in the churches, one ought to persuade himself with a firm confidence that Jesus Christ would be with them according to his promise."

76.—*This is returning to the Catholic Doctrine.*

Here, then, you see them obliged to confess two promises of Jesus Christ, that he will be present at and direct the judgments of his church. Now the Catholics never had any other foundation than this to believe the Church infallible. They make use of the first text, in order to shew he always is with her considered in her whole. They make use of the second to shew we ought to hold for certain he would be in the midst of two or three, were we assured that they were truly assembled in the name of Jesus Christ. Now what is doubtful in respect to two or three assembled in private, is certain in regard to the whole church assembled in body: we ought, therefore, to hold for certain, in such case, that Jesus Christ is there by his spirit, and by that means her judgments are infallible; or let them tell us what other use can be made of these texts in the case to which the Synod of Delft applies them.

---

* **Oct. 24, 1618. Syn. Delph. Int. Act. Dord. Sess. xxvi. p. 86. Matt. xviii. 20.**

77.—*The Remonstrants are made to hope an Œcumenical Council.*

It is true, the certain accomplishment of these promises is to be found in the body of the Universal Church and in her œcumenical council. Accordingly, it was to such a council the Remonstrants had appealed. They were answered*, "It was doubtful whether and when this œcumenical council could be assembled; mean while, the national one, called together by the states, would be like to one œcumenical and general, forasmuch as it would be composed of the deputies of all the reformed churches;" and in case they should find "themselves aggrieved by the national Synod, they would be free to appeal to an œcumenical council, provided, in the interim, they obey the national council."

78.—*The illusion of this Promise.*

The reflection we ought to make here is, that to speak of an œcumenical council was, amongst these new Reformed, a remainder of the church's language. For what could this word mean in these upstart churches? They durst not say, the deputies of all the Reformed Churches were an œcumenical council representing the Universal Church. It was, said they, not an œcumenical council, but like to an œcumenical council. What, then, should a true œcumenical council be composed of? Ought the Lutherans to be a part of it, who had excommunicated them? or the Catholics? or, in fine, some other churches? That is what the Calvinists could not tell, and in the condition they had put themselves by dividing from all the rest of Christendom, the great name of an œcumenical council, so venerable among Christians, was nothing to them but an insignificant word, which had no idea in their mind corresponding to it.

---

* Præf. ad Ecc. Ant. Syn. Dord.

79.—*Resolution of the Synod, that the Confessions of Faith might be revised, and at the same time an obligation imposed of subscribing them.*

The last observation I have to make, as to the procedure, regards the Confessions of Faith and the Catechisms received in the United Provinces. The provincial Synods obliged the Remonstrants to subscribe them *. These refused it absolutely, because they believed there were principles in them from which the condemnation of their doctrine might be clearly enough deduced. Upon this refusal they were treated as heretics and schismatics ; and this, notwithstanding it was agreed in the provincial Synods, and expressly declared in the Synod of Dort †, that these Confessions of Faith, so far from passing for a certain rule, might be examined anew ; so that they obliged the Remonstrants to subscribe a doctrine of faith, even without believing it themselves.

80.—*Decree of the pretended Reformed of France, at the Synod of Charenton, in order to approve that of Dort.—The certainty of Salvation acknowledged as the principal point.*

We have observed already, what is specified in the acts, that the canons of the Synod against the Remonstrants were established with the unanimous consent of all the voices, " not one excepted." The pretended reformed of France were not allowed to go to Dort though invited, but received its decisions in their national Synods, and amongst the rest, in that of Charenton, in 1620, where all the canons were translated into French, and a subscription of them enjoined in this form ‡:— " I receive, approve, and embrace all the doctrine taught in the Synod of Dort, as entirely conformable to God's word and to the Confession of Faith of our churches : the doctrine of the Arminians makes God's election to depend on the will of men, brings back Paganism, disguises Popery, and overthrows the whole certainty of salvation." These last words shew us what they judged of most importance in the decisions of Dort, and the certainty of salvation stands foremost as one of the most essential characteristics of Calvinism.

---

* Syn. Delph. Int. Act.

† Dord. Sess. xxv. p. 91. Sess. xxxii. 123.

‡ Sess. cxxv. cxxx. Præf. ad Ecc. Sin. de Cha. xxiii.

81.—*A new Subscription of the Synod of Dort, by the French Refugees.*

Even very lately, the first thing required of our ministers, who had taken refuge in Holland in these last contests about religion, was to subscribe the acts of the Synod of Dort; and so great a concourse, so many oaths, such a number of repeated acts, seem to make it plain, that nothing is more authentic in the whole party.

82.—*By the Decree of the Synod of Dort the Remonstrants stand deposed and excommunicated.*

Even the decree of the Synod shews the importance of this decision*, the Remonstrants being deprived by it "of the ministry, of their chairs of professorship in divinity, of all other functions as well ecclesiastic as academical, until, having satisfied the church, they be fully reconciled and received to her communion:" which shews they were treated as excommunicated, and that the sentence of excommunication passed against them in particular churches and synods was ratified; after which the Synod supplicates the states not to suffer "any other doctrine to be taught but that which was just defined, and to obstruct heresies and errors that were creeping in;" which manifestly regards the Arminian articles, by them qualified "as erroneous, and as the source of hidden errors."

83.—*The decisions of Dort not essential.—The sentiment of the Minister Jurieu.*

All these things might make one think these articles were accounted very essential to religion. Mr. Jurieu, nevertheless, assures us of the contrary: for after supposing "the church of Rome was in the sentiment of the Arminians, at least during the time of the Council of Trent," he thus proceeds†: "If she had no other errors, we should have done exceedingly ill to separate from her: we ought to have borne with those for peace sake, by reason that she was a church whereof we made part, and which had not banded herself to maintain grace according to St. Austin's system of divinity," &c. And accordingly, it is this which makes him conclude, "that the reason which made them cut the Remonstrants off from their communion was, for that they would not submit to a doctrine which, in the first place, we believed conformable to the word of God; which, in the second, we had bound ourselves, by a confederate confession, to maintain and defend against the Pelagianism of the church of Rome."

---

* Sent. Syn. de Remon. Sess. cxxxviii. p. 280.

† Syst. de l'Egl. liv. ii. ch. iii. p. 255. Ibid. ch. x. p. 305.

84.—*Semi-Pelagianism, according to this Author, damns none.*

Without assenting to his principles, or what he says of the Church of Rome, it suffices to relate his sentiments, which make him say in another place*, "that the churches of the Swiss and Geneva Confession would exclude from their communion a Semi-Pelagian, and one that should maintain the errors of the Remonstrants: yet it would not be their design thereby to declare this man damned, as if Semi-Pelagianism did damn." It, therefore, stands well grounded by the sentiment of this minister, that the doctrine of the Remonstrants may well exclude one from the particular confederation of the pretended reformed churches, but not, in general, from the fellowship of God's children; the which shews that these articles are not of the number of those they call fundamental.

Lastly, the same doctor †, in his "judgment concerning methods," where he labours at the reunion of the Lutherans to those of his communion, acknowledges, "that in order to stem a torrent of Pelagianism which was going to overflow the Low Countries, the Synod of Dort ought to oppose the most rigid and strict method to this Pelagian relaxation." He adds, "that with this view she might have imposed on her party the necessity of maintaining St. Austin's method, and obliged, I do not say all the members of her society, but, at least, all her doctors, preachers, and the rest concerned in teaching, yet without laying other churches and other communions under the same obligation." Whence it comes that the Synod, so far from binding all Christians to her tenets, does not even pretend to bind all her members, but only her preachers and doctors; which shews what these grave decisions of the new Reformation are in the main; when, after so much boasting the express word of God, all terminates at last in obliging doctors to teach, by common agreement, a doctrine which private men are neither obliged to believe nor profess.

85.—*The tenets in debate at Dort were the most popular and the most essential.*

Nor can it be answered that these are dogmata which appertain not to the knowledge of the people: for besides that all dogmata revealed by God are made for the people as well as the rest, and there are certain cases wherein they are not allowed to be ignorant of them; that which was defined at Dort ought, above all others, to be a most popular dogma, since it principally concerned that certainty every body ought to have of his own salvation: a dogma, wherein the Calvinists laid the main foundation of the Christian religion.

---

* Syst. de l'Egl. liv. ii. ch. iii. p. 249.

† Jug. sur les meth. Sect. xviii. pp. 159, 160.

86.—*The minister Jurieu makes the Synod of Dort act more by policy than truth.*

All the rest of the decisions of Dort, as you have seen, tending to this dogma of certainty, it was no question of idle speculation, but of practice, which they judged the most necessary and of the utmost consequence to religion; and, nevertheless, Mr. Jurieu has represented this doctrine not so much as a capital dogma, but as a method they were obliged to follow; and not as the most certain neither, but as being "the most rigid." "In order to stem," says he *, "this torrent of Pelagianism, it was necessary to expose against it the most rigid and strict method, and to decide," adds he, "many things to the prejudice of that liberty of disputing *pro* and *con*, which always had subsisted among the Reformed:" as if this were a political affair, or that other things were to be considered in church decisions than the pure truth revealed by God clearly and expressly in his word; or, after a full knowledge thereof, it were allowable to shift and decline from it.

87.—*They were ready to bear with Pelagianism in the Arminians.*

But what this minister teaches in another place, is still more surprising, since he declares to the Arminians, that it is not properly Arminianism, but Socinianism, which they reject in them †. "These Remonstrants," says he, "ought not to wonder we offer peace to sects that seem to be of the same mind with them in respect to the Synod of Dort, and do not offer it to them. Their Semi-Socinianism will ever be a wall of separation between them and us." Here then is what makes the separation. "It is because, at this day," proceeds he, "Socinianism is in the most elevated stations amongst them." It is plainly seen, were it not for this obstacle, that they might unite with the Arminians, without concerning themselves for "that torrent of Pelagianism with which they overflowed the Low Countries," nor for the decisions of Dort, nor even for the confederacy of all Calvinism in favour of the pretended sentiments of St. Austin.

---

* Jug. sur les meth. Sect. xviii. p. 59.

† Ib. Sect. xvi. p. 137.

88.—*The rest of the Ministers are of the same opinion with Mr. Jurieu.*

Mr. Jurieu is not the only one that has revealed to us this secret of the party. The minister Matthew Bochart had assured us before him [*], that, "if the Remonstrants had only differed from the rest of the Calvinists in the five points decided at the Synod of Dort, the difference might have been adjusted," which he confirms by the opinions of other doctors of the sect, even with that of the Synod itself.

89.—*The Reformation allows private men to arrogate to themselves more capacity for understanding sound Doctrine, than all the rest of the Church.*

It is true, he says at the same time [†], that although they were disposed to tolerate, in particular peaceable and modest men, sentiments opposite to those of the Synod, they could not have suffered them in the ministers, who ought to be better instructed than the rest: but this, however, is enough to evince, that these decisions, "which were opposed against Pelagianism," although made by the Synod with so great solemnity and with such frequent declarations of their following nothing therein but the pure and express word of God, are not very material to Christianity; and what is more surprising, is, that they hold for modest men such private persons as, after knowing the decisions of all the doctors, nay, as speaks Mr. Bochart, "of all the Churches of the party as many as there are in Europe," yet believe they are better able to understand which is sound doctrine, not only than any one of these in particular, but even than all of them together.

90.—*The Doctors themselves are very much relaxed in the observance of the decrees of Dort.*

It is also very certain, that the doctors, in whom sentiments opposed to those of the Synod were not to be tolerated, are greatly slackened in that regard [‡]. The ministers who have written in latter times, and among others Mr. Beaulieu, whom we have seen at Sedan one of the most learned and pacific of them all, soften as much as they are able the dogma of inamissibility of justice, and even that of the certainty of salvation; and two reasons move them to it: the first is, the Lutherans' dislike to it, whom they are willing to be united to at any rate; the second is, the absurdity and impiety discoverable in these tenets by never so little an inspection. The doctors may, by degrees, inure themselves to them in consequence of the false principles they are imbued with; but plain and sincere people will not easily be persuaded, that every one of them, to have true faith, must assure himself he has no damnation to fear, let him commit what crimes he pleases; much less, that he is sure of preserving sanctity and grace in such crimes.

---

[*] Diallact. c. viii. p. 126, &c. Ib. 130. Ib. 127.

[†] Ib. 126, et seq. Ib. 127.

[‡] The. de Art. Just. part. ii. Th. 42, 43. Item. Th. An Homo solis nat. virib., &c. Corol. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, &c.

As often as our Reformed disclaim these impious tenets, let us praise God for it, and without more disputing, entreat them only to consider that the Holy Ghost could not have been in those that taught them, and who made a great part of the Reformation to consist in notions so derogatory to Christian justice.

91.—*The Synod of Dort hath done no good, and spite of all its decrees Mr. Jurieu is a Pelagian.*

This, however, we may conclude from thence: that, after all, this great Synod has proved quite useless, and neither cured the people, nor even the pastors, for whom it was principally intended, inasmuch as what is called Pelagianism in the Reformation (the thing the Synod resolved to destroy) still stands its ground; for I ask, who has been cured of this evil? Not those surely who do not believe the Synod; nor even those who do believe it; for Mr. Jurieu, for instance, who is of this last number, and seems to continue so firm in the confederation, as he calls it, of the Calvinian Churches against Pelagianism, in reality does not disapprove it, since he maintains, as we have seen, that it is not contrary to piety*. He is like to those Socinians, who when asked if they believe the eternal divinity of the Son of God, make no difficulty of answering, they believe it: but urged a little further, will tell you, that the contrary belief, in the main, is neither opposite to piety nor true faith. Such are true enemies to the Son of God's divinity, since they hold the tenet for indifferent: Mr. Jurieu is a Pelagian, and the enemy of grace, in the same sense.

---

* S. n. pp. 83, 84, 87.

92.—*Another Pelagian saying of the same Minister, and his wretched contradictions.*

In effect, what is the tendency of these words of his, "in exhortation, you must of necessity speak like a Pelagian?" This is not the speech of a divine; for if Pelagianism be a heresy, and a heresy that renders useless the cross of Jesus Christ, as has been so much preached even by the Reformation, you cannot keep at too great a distance from it in exhortation, so far from retaining the least tincture of it *.

This minister is no less inconsistent when he excuses the Pelagians or Semi-Pelagians of the Augsburg Confession, together with the Arminians, following the same sentiments, under pretext that, "whilst they are Semi-Pelagians in word and spirit, they are the disciples of St. Austin in the heart;" for can he be ignorant that a perverted spirit soon corrupts the heart? Men must be very closely attached to error when even truth presented does not awaken them; nay, presented by a synod made up of their whole communion.

When therefore Mr. Jurieu says, on one hand, that Pelagianism does not damn; and on the other, that you will "never make truly pious men of Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians †," though he be never so subtile a divine, he could not shew more clearly that he does not reflect on what he says, and that, by endeavouring to save all, he loses all.

93.—*This Minister falls back into the excesses of the Reformers relating to the cause of Sin.*

He also thinks he has kept clear from that blasphemy which makes God the author of sin, into which, he pretends, none of his party has fallen "for this hundred years;" and he himself relapses into it in that very book where he pretends to shew they are no longer guilty of it ‡. For after all, whilst you continue to deprive mankind of the liberty of their choice, and believe that free-will subsists together with an entire and inevitable necessity, it always will be true that neither men, nor prevaricating angels, could avoid sinning; and so the sins they fell into are the necessary consequence resulting from those dispositions their Creator placed them in. Now Mr. Jurieu is one of those who leave this inevitable necessity whole and entire, when he says, we know nothing of our soul, "only that she thinks," nor can we define what is requisite "to constitute her free *." He owns, therefore, he does not know but it is this inevitable necessity which drags us into evil as well as good, and by that means sinks into all the excesses of the first Reformers, from which he boasts that his party has been free a whole age.

---

* Meth. Sect. xv. p. 131. Ibid. Sect. xiv. pp. 113, 114.

† S. n. 83, 84, 87. Meth. Sect. xv. pp. 113, 121.

‡ S. n. 6.

To avoid these terrible inconveniences, you must at least believe, if not arrived to the comprehension of it, that there is no admitting, without blasphemy and making God the author of sin, this invincible necessity which the Remonstrants reproached the pretended Reformers with, and from which the Synod of Dort has not justified them.

94.—*Connivance of the Synod of Dort, not only at the excesses of the pretended Reformers, but also at those of the Remonstrants.*

And in reality, I observe that nothing is said in any part of the Synod against these damnable excesses. It was willing to spare the Reformers and save the beginnings of the Reformation from eternal infamy.

Yet at least it ought not to have extended the like condescension to the Remonstrants, who opposed to the excesses of the Reformers other no less criminal excesses.

They printed in Holland in 1618, a little before the Synod, a book under this title—"The State of Controversies in the Low Countries †," where it is shewn it was the doctrine of the Remonstrants that certain accidents might befal God; that he was liable to change; that his prescience of certain events was not certain; that he proceeded by discoursing and conjecture in drawing, as we do, one thing from another; and other the like numberless errors, wherein the Author sides with those philosophers who destroy God's foreknowledge, for fear of lessening the liberty of man. There it is made appear they went so far astray as to make God corporeal, to attribute to him three essences, and the rest that may be learned from that Book, which is very perspicuous and concise. It was composed in order to prepare, for the approaching Synod, the subject matter of their deliberations: but none of all these things were mentioned at it, no more than many others as materially started by the Remonstrants. The whole care of the Synod was taken up in preserving those Articles which are peculiar to

---

* Meth. Sect. pp. 129, 132.

† Specim. Controv. Belg. ex Offic. Elzev. pp. 2, 4, 7, &c.

Calvinism; and more zeal was exhibited by them for these opinions, than for the fundamental principles of Christianity.

95.—*The Decree of Charenton receiving the Lutherans to Communion.*—1631.

The great deference which we have seen was paid to the Lutherans, prevailed nothing with them in regard to an union, they still persisting to hold the whole party of the Sacramentarians for excommunicated. At last the Reformed of France, in their national Synod of Charenton, made this memorable decree, wherein they declare, "that the Germans and others following the Confession of Augsburg, for so much as the Churches of the Augsburg Confession agree with the others that are reformed in the fundamental principles and tenets of the true religion, and that in their worship there is neither idolatry nor superstition, may, without making abjuration, be received to the holy table, to contract marriage with the faithful of our Confession, and to present, as god-fathers, children to baptism, in promising the Consistory they will never solicit them to act counter, directly or indirectly, to the doctrine received and professed in our Churches, but will be contented with instructing them in the principles wherein we all agree."

96.—*The Consequences of this Decree.*

In consequence of this decree, they were obliged to say*, "that the doctrine of the Real Presence, taken in itself, has no venom in it: that it is neither contrary to piety nor God's honour, nor the good of mankind: that although the opinion of the Lutherans relating to the Eucharist infers, no less than that of Rome, the destruction of Jesus Christ's humanity, this consequence nevertheless cannot be imputed to them without calumny, inasmuch as it is formally rejected by them,"—so that it is an allowed maxim that, in matters of religion, none ought to charge on others the consequences they draw from their doctrine, but only such things as they allow in express terms.

97.—*The Calvinists had never advanced so far before.*

Never had the Sacramentarians, before this time, made so great an advance towards the Lutherans. The novelty of this decree does not consist in saying, that the Real Presence, and the other disputed points between both parties, do not regard the fundamentals of salvation; for it must be owned ingenuously, that ever since the time of the Conference of Marpurg, that is, so long ago as the year 1529 *, the Zuinglians offered the Lutherans to hold them for brethren notwithstanding their doctrine of the Real Presence; and never, from that time, did they believe it fundamental, but required that the fraternity should be mutual, and owned equally on both sides; which being refused them by Luther, they likewise continued to disown those for brethren who were so averse to pass the same judgment in their favour: whereas, in the Synod of Charenton, it is the Sacramentarians alone that receive the Lutherans into that fellowship, notwithstanding that they are held by them for excommunicated.

---

* Daillè Apol. ch. vii. p. 43. Id. Lettre à Mongl.

98.—*Memorable date of the Decree of Charenton.*

The date of this decree is remarkable: it was made in 1631, when the great Gustavus was thundering in Germany, and when it was currently believed throughout the whole Reformation, that Rome itself would be soon in the power of the Lutherans. God had otherwise ordained: the year following, this victorious King was killed at the battle of Lutzen, and all the rare discoveries made concerning him in the prophecies were now to be retracted.

99.—*Great change in controversies by means of this Decree.—It convicts the Calvinists of calumny.*

Mean while the decree passed, and the Catholics observed the greatest change imaginable in the doctrine of the Protestants.

In the first place, all that horror they had infused into the people against the doctrine of the Real Presence appeared manifestly unjust and calumnious. The doctors may say what they please of the matter: but it was the Real Presence on which the people's aversion was chiefly bent. This doctrine had been represented to them, not only as gross and carnal, but also as brutal and full of barbarity, whereby men became Cyclopses, eaters of human flesh and human blood, parricides that eat their Father and their God. But now, since the decree of this Synod, it stands confessed, that all these exaggerations, with which the silly vulgar were fascinated for so long a time, are calumnies; and the doctrine that was made to pass for so impious and inhuman, has no longer any thing in it that is contrary to piety.

---

* S. l. ii. n. 45.

100.—*The literal sense and the Real Presence necessary.*

Thereby even it becomes the most credible and the most necessary; for the chief reason inducing to wrest the sense of these words—" Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood *," and also of these—" Eat, this is my body; drink, this is my blood †,"—to spiritual and metaphorical meanings was, because they seemed to lead to sin by commanding to eat human flesh, and to drink human blood: so that St. Austin's rule, of interpreting spiritually what appears to incline to evil, was here to take place. But at present this reason carries no longer any the least probability; all this imaginary crime is vanished, and nothing prevents taking the words of our Saviour in their true literal sense.

The people were made to abhor the Catholic doctrine, as a doctrine that destroyed Jesus Christ's human nature, and ruined the mystery of his ascension. But they must no longer be affrighted at these consequences, since the denial of them sufficiently acquits whosoever denies them.

101.—*The chief argument in behalf of the rupture rendered frivolous.*

These horrors thus raised in the minds of the people were, to speak the truth, the real cause of their departure from the Church. Read in all the acts of the pretended martyrs the cause for which they suffered, and you will find everywhere, that it was for the doctrine opposite to the Real Presence. Consult a Melancthon, a Sturmius, a Peucer, all the rest that were against condemning the doctrine of the Zuinglians—you will find their chief reason to be, because it was for this doctrine that such a number of the faithful laid down their lives in France and England. These wretched martyrs persuaded themselves, in dying for this doctrine, they died for a fundamental point of faith and piety: at present this doctrine is innocent, and excludes none from the sacred table, nor from the kingdom of heaven.

---

* John vi. 53.

† Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.

102.—*The hatred of the People turned against Transubstantiation, a thing of much less importance.*

To preserve in the hearts of the people their aversion to the Catholic doctrine, it was requisite to turn it on another object than the Real Presence. Transubstantiation is now the great crime: there is now no manner of difficulty in admitting Jesus Christ really present; in admitting one and the same body in different places at once; in admitting the entire body in every crumb of bread: the grand error consists in taking the bread away: what regards Jesus Christ is of small importance; what regards the bread is alone essential.

103.—*Jesus Christ no longer adorable in the Eucharist, as formerly believed by Protestants.*

All the maxims, till then held for unquestionable, regarding the adoration of Jesus Christ, are now changed. Calvin and the rest of them had demonstrated, that wherever Jesus Christ, so adorable an object, was held present by so special a Presence as that acknowledged in the Eucharist, it was not lawful to withhold that adoration which is due unto him. But now, Jesus Christ's Presence in any place is not enough to make him be adored in it; he must command it, he must "declare his will, in order to be adored in such and such a state *;" otherwise, as much God as he is, he will meet with no worship from us. More than this, he must shew himself: "if the body of Jesus Christ be in a place insensibly, and in a manner imperceptible to all the senses, he does not oblige us to worship him in such a place." His word does not suffice, it is necessary he should be seen: you may hear the voice of the king never so much; if you see him not with your own eyes, you owe him no respect, or, at least, he must declare expressly it is his intention to be honoured; otherwise you should behave as in his absence. Were it the case of an earthly king, none would question paying him what is his due the moment it is known where he is; but thus to honour the King of heaven would be idolatry, and it would be to be feared lest he should take the worship to be given to another than himself.

---

* Cont. Westp. Cont. Heshu. Dial. du Minist. Boch. sur le syn. de Cha. i. p. 24. Ejusd. Dial. part ii. cap. vii. Sedani, p. 21.

104.—*Interior Acts of Adoration are tolerated in the Lutherans, and the exterior, which are but the tokens of them, rejected.*

But here is a device that is new and surprising. The Lutheran, who believes Jesus Christ present, shall receive him as his God ; shall put his trust in him, shall invoke him ; and the Synod of Charenton decides, "there is neither idolatry, nor superstition in his worship :" but if he make any perceptible act of adoration, he idolizes; that is to say, it is allowable to have the substance of adoration, which is the interior sentiment, but not allowable to testify it; and you become an idolater in making appear, by some posture of respect, the sense of that truly sacred veneration you have in your heart.

105.—*Frivolous Answer.*

"But the reason of this is," say they *, "because, should the Lutheran adore Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, who is there together with the bread, there would be danger lest the adoration should be referred to the bread alike as to Jesus Christ; or, however, lest some should think the intention was to refer it so:" no question, when the wise men adored Jesus Christ, either in his crib, or in a cradle, it was to be feared lest they should worship, together with Jesus Christ, either the crib or the cradle; or in fine, lest the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph should take them for worshippers of the cradle rather than of the divine infant lying in it. These were the subtilties introduced by the decree of Charenton.

106.—*Ubiquity tolerated.*

Moreover, the doctrine of Ubiquity, which had been accounted, and with reason, alike by the Sacramentarians and by Catholics, a most monstrous doctrine, confounding both natures of Jesus Christ, becomes the doctrine of the Saints.

For you are not to imagine that the defenders of this doctrine were excepted out of the union : the Synod speaks in general of the churches of the Augsburg Confession, whereof it is well known the greatest part are Ubiquitarians, and the ministers assure us †, Ubiquity hath nothing mortal in it, though it destroys, more expressly than ever Eutychianism did, the human nature of our Lord.

---

* Dial. du Min. Boch. sur le syn. de Cha. i. p. 24.

† Boch. Ibid. Dial. xv. part ii. c. vii.

107.—*Nothing but the external Worship is looked upon as important.*

In a word, little account is made of all whatsoever causes no alteration in the worship, even in the external worship : for the belief, which you may have interiorly, is no obstacle to communion; nothing but the respect you shew externally makes the sin; and this is what we are brought to by those who are always preaching to us adoration in spirit and in truth.

108.—*The Foundation of Piety formerly acknowledged by them, is changed.*

It plainly appears, without needing my intimation, that after the Synod of Charenton, neither the inamissibility of justice, nor the certainty of salvation, are any longer a necessary foundation of piety, since the Lutherans are admitted to communion with the contrary doctrine.

109.—*The Disputes about Predestination concern not the Substance of Religion.*

No more must they speak to us of absolute predestination and absolute decrees as of a fundamental article, since they cannot deny, according to Mr. Jurieu, "but there is piety in those great communions of Protestants, wherein both absolute decrees, and grace of itself efficacious, are so roughly handled." The same minister is agreed, "that the Protestants of Germany make the foreknowledge of our faith enter into that gratuitous love whereby God has loved us in Jesus Christ." Thus the decree of predestination will not be an absolute decree, and independent of all foreknowledge, but a conditional decree, including the condition of our future faith; and this is what Mr. Jurieu does not condemn *.

110.—*Two other remarkable Novelties ensuing from the Decree of Charenton.*

But here are the two most remarkable novelties which the decree of Charenton has introduced into the pretended Reformation : first, the dispute on fundamental points; and secondly, the dispute on the nature of the church.

---

† Jugement sur les Meth. Sect. xiv. p. 113. Ibid. sect. xviii. p. 158.

111.—*Distinction of fundamental Points, and the inevitable perplexity of our Reformed.*

As to fundamental points, the Catholics thus argued with them. "If the Real Presence, if Ubiquity, if so many other important points, contested for more than an age between the Lutherans and Calvinists, be not fundamental, why should those be more so on which you dispute with the Church of Rome? Does not she believe the Trinity, the Incarnation, the whole Creed? Has she laid any other foundation than Jesus Christ? All you object against her, on this head, in order to shew that she has another, are so many consequences which she denies, and which, according to your own principles, ought not to be imputed to her. Wherein, then, do you place precisely what is fundamental in religion?" To relate here all they have said concerning fundamental points, some one way, some another, and the greatest part confessing that it is all a mystery to them, and a thing rather to be felt than explained, were an endless task, and involving one's self with them in a labyrinth from whence there is no exit.

112.—*They are forced to own that the Church of Rome is a true Church, wherein one may be saved.*

The other dispute was not less important: for this principle being once established by them, that those who retain the principal foundations of faith, however separated in communion, are, in the main, the same Church and the same society of God's children, worthy of his holy table and his kingdom, the Catholics demand how they can be excluded from this church and from eternal salvation? For now it will no longer serve their turn to say, the Church of Rome is a church excluding the whole world, and which the whole world ought to exclude: for you see the Lutherans, who exclude the Calvinists, are not excluded. It is this which has produced this new system of the church which makes so great a noise, and wherein, after all, they cannot but comprehend the Church of Rome.

113.—*The Conference of Cassel, where the Lutherans of Rintel come to an Agreement with the Calvinists of Marpurg.*

The Protestants of Germany have not been in all places alike inexorable in regard of the Calvinists. In 1661, a conference was held at Cassel between the Calvinists of Marpurg and the Lutherans of Rintel, where both parties entered into a brotherly fellowship. I own this union was without consequence in the other parts of Germany, and I have not been able to discover what even was the consequence of it between the contracting parties: but in the agreement there was one important article not to be forgotten.

114.—*Important article of this Agreement relating to the breaking of the Eucharistic Bread.*

The Calvinists reproached the Lutherans that, in the celebration of the Eucharist, they omitted the breaking of the bread, which had a divine institution*. It is the current doctrine of Calvinism, that the breaking makes part of the Sacrament as being a symbol of that body broken which Jesus would give to his disciples; that for this reason it was practised by Jesus Christ, that it is of precept, and comprehended by our Saviour in this ordinance, "Do ye this." This is what was maintained by the Calvinists of Marpurg, and denied by the Lutherans of Rintel. They nevertheless united, each side persisting in their sentiments; and it was said by those of Marpurg, "That the breaking did not appertain to the essence, but only to the integrity of the Sacrament, as being necessary thereto by the example and commandment of Jesus Christ, so that the Lutherans, without breaking the bread, had nevertheless the substance of the Supper, and both parties might mutually tolerate each other."

115.—*Demonstration in favour of Communion under one kind.*

A minister, who answered a treatise concerning Communion under both kinds, has examined this conference which was objected against them: the fact passed for unquestionable, and the minister agreed that the breaking of the bread, although commanded by Jesus Christ, did not appertain to the essence, but only to the integrity of the Sacrament†. Here, then, have we the essence of the Sacrament manifestly separated from the divine precept, and reasons have been found to dispense with that which they said was commanded by Jesus Christ: after which I do not see how they can urge the precept of receiving under both kinds; forasmuch that as though we were agreed Jesus Christ had commanded the receiving of them, we should still be admitted to examine whether this divine commandment regarded the essence, or only the integrity.

---

* Coll. Cass. q. de fract. pan.

† Traité de Communion sous les deux Especes, part ii. ch. xii. La Roq. Rep. part ii. ch. xvii. p. 307.

116.—*Present state of Controversies in Germany.*

The present state of controversies in Germany between the Lutherans and Calvinists may be likewise seen in the same conference; where it will be perceived, that the constant doctrine of the divines of the Augsburg Confession is, that grace is universal; that it is resistible; that it is amissible; that predestination is conditional, and presupposes the foreknowledge of our faith; lastly, that the grace of conversion is annexed to an action purely natural, and depending on our own strength, namely, on our carefulness to hear sermons *: which the learned Beaulieu confirms by many testimonies, to which we could add many others, were not the thing past dispute, as might have been seen by the testimony of Mr. Jurieu †, and had we not spoken of this matter already.

117.—*The relaxation of the principles of the Lutherans give occasion to those of Cameron and of his disciples, touching Universal Grace.*

Accordingly, one may have seen in this history, how Melancthon had softened, among the Lutherans, that extreme rigour wherewith Luther maintained absolute and particular decrees, and how unanimously it is taught amongst them, that God wills seriously and sincerely the salvation of all men; that he offers them Jesus Christ as their redeemer; that he calls them to him by preaching and the promises of his gospel; and that his Spirit is ever ready to be efficacious in them, if they do but hearken to his word; that, finally, it is attributing to God two contrary wills, to say on one side, he proposes his gospel to all mankind; and on the other, that he will save but a very small number of them ‡. In consequence of that complaisance, still continued in behalf of the Lutherans, John Cameron of Scotland, a famous minister, and Professor of Divinity in the Academy of Saumur, there taught an universal vocation and grace, declared in behalf of all mankind by the wonders of God's works, by his word, and the Sacraments. This doctrine of Cameron was strenuously and ingeniously defended by his disciples Amiraud and Testard, professors of divinity in the same town. This entire Academy embraced it: Du Moulin put himself at the head of the contrary party, and engaged in this sentiment the Academy of Sedan, where he ruled uncontrolled ; and in our days we have seen the whole Reformation divided in France, with much warmth, between Saumur and Sedan. Spite of the censures of the Synods, which suppressed the doctrine of universal grace, yet without qualifying it as heretical or erroneous, the most learned ministers undertook to defend it. Daille made its apology, to which Blondel put a preface very much to the advantage of the abettors of this sentiment; and universal grace triumphed even in Sedan, where the minister Beaulieu taught it in our days.

---

* Thes. de q. An hom. in stat. pecc. solis nat. viribus, &c. Th. xxxi. et seq.

† S. n. 109. S. l. viii. n. 48, et seq.

‡ S. l. viii. n. 22, et seq. Epit. Tit. de præd. Conc. p. 617. Solida repetit. Cod. Tit. p. 804.

118.—*Whether Universal Grace be contrary to the Synod of Dort.*

It had not equal success out of this kingdom, particularly in Holland, where it was judged opposite to the synod of Dort. But on the contrary, Blondel and Daille shewed[*], that the divines of Great Britain and Bremen had maintained in the Synod "an universal will and intention" of saving all mankind, a sufficient grace given to all; a grace without which one could not renew in himself God's image. This is what these divines had publicly declared in the Synod, nor merited the less for it the praises and congratulations of this whole assembly.

119.—*Decree passed at Geneva against Universal Grace, and the question resolved by the Magistrate.—Helvetic Formulary.*—1669-1671.

Geneva, ever attached to Calvin's rigorous propositions, was very averse to this Universality, which nevertheless was carried into its very bowels by the French ministers. Every family was now in contention for or against it, when the Magistrate interposed. From the court of Twenty-five it was carried to that of the Two Hundred. These magistrates had the face to make their pastors and professors enter into dispute before them, and set themselves up as judges in a question of the most refined theology. Powerful recommendations came from the Swiss in behalf of particular grace against universal grace; a rigorous decree was issued in condemnation of the latter. They published the formulary of a divine which the Swiss approved, wherein the system of universal grace was declared "not a little remote from the sound doctrine revealed in Scripture;" and that nothing might be wanting to it, the sovereign magistrate commanded that all doctors, ministers, and professors, should subscribe the formulary in these words: "Thus do I believe; thus do I profess; thus will I teach." This is no submission of polity and order, it is a pure act of faith enjoined by the secular authority; this is what the Reformation ends in, subjecting the church to the world, learning to ignorance, and faith to the magistrate.

---

[*] Dall. Apol. Tract. part ii. Blond. Act. auth. viii. et seq. p. 77. Jud. The. Mag. Brit. de Art. ii. inter. Act. Syn. Dord. part ii. p. 287. Jud. Brem. Ibid. p. 113, et seq.

120.—*Another decision of the Helvetic Formulary, concerning the Hebrew text, which the learned of the party laugh at.—Variation in regard to the Vulgate.*

This Helvetic formulary had also another clause, wherein, not concerning themselves with the Septuagint, nor the Targums, nor the original Samaritan, nor with any of the old interpreters, nor any of the ancient readings, they canonized even the points of the Hebrew text, such as we now have it, declaring it untainted with any even the least faults of the transcriber, and clear from all injuries of time. The authors of this decree were not sensible how egregiously they exposed themselves to the laughter of all learned men, even of their own communion; but they adhered to the old maxims of the Reformation, then but ignorant. They were vexed that the readings of the Vulgate, formerly taken by them for so many falsifications, were daily more and more approved by the learned of the party; and by fixing the original text, such as it is at this time, they thought to rid themselves of the necessity of tradition, never reflecting that, under the name of the Hebrew text, instead of ecclesiastic traditions, and that of the ancient Synagogue, they consecrated those even of the Rabbins.

121.—*Other Decisions of Geneva and the Swiss how much condemned by Mr. Claude.*

Another decree passed also at Geneva concerning Faith in 1675, wherein was confirmed that of 1649, whereby they added two new Articles to the Confession of Faith; the first, importing "that the imputation of Adam's sin was anterior to corruption;" the second, "that, in the economy of the divine decrees, the sending of Jesus Christ is after the decree of election." They ordered that all those who should refuse to subscribe these two new articles of Faith, should be excluded and deposed from the ministry and all ecclesiastical functions.

This decision was judged very odd even in the party, and Turretin, minister and professor at Geneva, was greatly upbraided for it by Mr. Claude[*], as appears by a letter of this minister dated the twentieth of June, 1675, which Lewis du Moulin, son to the minister Peter du Moulin, and uncle to the minister Jurieu, caused to be printed.

Mr. Claude complains in this letter[†], "that the Swiss were solicited to draw up a Formulary conformable to that of Geneva, containing the same points and the same restrictions, in order to be added to their Confession of Faith:" and it is plain from a remark of Du Moulin, inserted in the same letter[‡], that the Swiss had in fact struck this stroke which Mr. Claude judged so terrible.

Nevertheless, the same minister maintains that it is not lawful to add thus[§] "new articles of Faith to those of his Confession; and that it is dangerous to remove the ancient landmarks which have been set by our fathers[||]." I would to God our Reformed had always had before their eyes this maxim of the wise man, which they so frequently are obliged to return to, in order to terminate the divisions they see daily breeding in the midst of them! Mr. Claude proposes it to those of Geneva[¶], and is astonished that this Church "should thus make new articles of Faith and new laws of preaching:" he makes bold to say[**], that acting in this manner is setting up gods of their own, and breaking unity with all the Churches which are not of their own opinion: to wit, "with those of France, with those of England, with those of Poland, of Prussia, and Germany;" that the matter in hand is not of mere discipline, in which Churches may be allowed to vary, but that it is separating themselves in[††] "points of doctrine unalterable in their nature, which they cannot, with a good conscience, teach differently:" so that this is not only "setting up for themselves a particular ministry," but also sowing "the seeds of a fatal division" in faith itself, and, in short, "shutting their hearts" against other Churches.

If now one should be desirous to know to what length Geneva carried her rigour, he will be informed from the same letter*; for it specifies, "that the signing of the articles was exacted with an inconceivable severity, and exacted even from those who came to Geneva to be ordained with the design of serving elsewhere; that the same necessity of subscription was laid on them as on those of Geneva itself; that it was exacted with the same rigour from pastors already received, notwithstanding they had already grown old in the labours of the ministry:" and this, says Mr. Claude †, "is, as much as in them lies, wresting every where the cure from those that are of different opinions, namely, *from all the rest of the Churches,* and condemning their own selves, as having hitherto maintained an unjust peace with people against whom they ought to have declared war."

---

[*] Fascic. Ep. 1676, pp. 83, 94.

[†] Ibid. p. 95.

[‡] P. 101.

[§] Ibid. p. 15.

[||] Prov. xxii. 28.

[¶] Fascic. Ep. p. 89.

[**] Pp. 90, 91, 98, 103.

[††] Ibid. pp. 93, 100.

All these remonstrances were of no effect; the church of Geneva stood firm, no less than that of the Swiss, both of them in the notion that their determinations were grounded on the word of God: which still continues to make it manifest that, under the covert of this word, it is his own conceits every man pays worship to; and if they have no other principle whereby to agree in the sense of this word, there never will be amongst their Churches any other than a political and exterior union, such as subsists with those of Geneva, who in the main have broken off from all the rest; and in order to find something fixed, it is necessary, after Mr. Claude's example, that they should be brought back to this maxim of the wise man, "not to remove the land-marks set them by their forefathers ‡;" that is, they must hold to the decisions already made by those in matters of faith.

122.—*The Test Act in England: therein the English approach to our sentiments, and only, through manifest error, condemn the Church of Rome.*

The famous Test well deserves a place in this history, forasmuch as it was one of the principal acts of Religion in England. The parliament held at London in 1678, passed an Act enjoining the following declaration. "I, A. B. do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration, by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous, &c." The particulars to be observed in this Profession of Faith are, first, that it only attacks Transubstantiation and not the Real Presence, wherein it follows the amendment which Elizabeth had made in Edward the Sixth's Reformation. There are only added to it these words, " at or after the Consecration," which manifestly allow the belief of the Real Presence before the manducation, since they exclude nothing, as is plain, but the sole change of substance.

---

* Fascic. Ep. pp. 94, 95. † Pp. 97, 100. ‡ Prov. xxii. 28.

Thus, a good English Protestant, without blemish to his religion or conscience, may believe that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are really and substantially present in the bread and wine immediately after consecration. If the Lutherans believed as much, it is certain they would adore him. Neither do the English place any obstacle to it in their Test: and as they receive the Eucharist kneeling, nothing hinders their acknowledging and worshipping Jesus Christ there present, in the same spirit that we do: after this, to cavil with us about Transubstantiation, is a proceeding little worthy of them.

In the following words of the Test, the Invocation, or as they call it, the Adoration of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, with the sacrifice of the Mass, are condemned as acts of " superstition and idolatry:" not absolutely, but " as they are now used in the church of Rome." But the reason of this was, that the English are too well versed in antiquity to be ignorant, that the Fathers of the fourth century (to ascend no higher at present) did invoke the Blessed Virgin and the saints. They know that St. Gregory of Nazianzum approves expressly, in the mouth of a martyr, that piety which moved her to beg of the Blessed Virgin, " that she would assist a Virgin engaged in danger*." They know that all the Fathers have made, and solemnly approved in their Homilies, the like invocations addressed to saints: nay, in respect of them, have even used the word Invocation †. As for that of adoration, they know likewise, it is equivocal no less among the holy Fathers than in Scripture; and does not always signify, rendering to a person divine honours; and for this reason also St. Gregory of Nazianzum made no difficulty, in many places, of saying that the relics of the martyrs were adored, and that God did not disdain to confirm such an adoration by miracles. The English are too well read in antiquity to be ignorant of this doctrine and these practices of the ancient Church, and bear her too great a veneration to accuse her of superstition and idolatry: it is this which makes them use this restriction, which we observe in their Test, and suppose, in the church of Rome, a kind of invocation and adoration different from that of the Fathers, because they were very sensible, without this precaution, the Test would be no more subscribed with a good conscience by the learned Protestants than by Catholics.

---

* Orat. in Cyp. Basil. Orat. in Mam.

† Greg. Nyss. Orat. in Theo. Amb. Serm. de S. Vit. Greg. Naz. Orat. in Jul. i. in Machab., &c.

Nevertheless it is certain, as to the fact, that we demand nothing of the saints but the partnership of their prayers, no more than the ancients did; and that we honour nothing in their relics, but what they honoured in them. If we sometimes entreat the Saints, not to pray, but to give and act, the learned among the English will agree that the ancients have done it like us *, and like us have understood it in that sense which attributes favours received, not only to the Sovereign that distributes them, but also to the intercessors who obtain them; so that there never will be found any real difference between the ancients, whom the English will not condemn, and us, whom they do condemn, but through mistake, and by laying to our charge what we do not believe.

I say the same of the sacrifice of Mass. The English are better skilled in antiquity than to be ignorant that in all times the same gifts were offered to God, in the sacred mysteries and the celebration of the Eucharist, as were afterwards distributed to the people, and that these were offered to him no less for the dead than for the living. The ancient Liturgies containing the form of this oblation, as well in the east as west, are in the hands of every one, and the English are far from accusing them either of superstition or idolatry. There is then a way of offering to God the Eucharistic sacrifice for the living and the dead, which the Protestant Church of England judges neither superstitious nor idolatrous; and if they reject the Roman Mass, it is by supposing that it is different from that of the ancients.

But this difference is none at all; one drop of water is not more like another, than the Roman Mass is like, as to its essence and substance, to the Mass which the Greeks and the rest of Christians received from their forefathers. For which reason the church of Rome, when she admits them to her communion, does not prescribe another Mass to them. Thus the Roman Church has not, in the main, another sacrifice than

---

* Greg. Naz. Orat. funeb. Ath. et Basil, &c.

that which, by the confession of the English Protestants themselves, was offered in the east and west ever since the beginning of Christianity.

Hence it clearly follows that the Roman doctrine, as well concerning Invocation and Adoration, as the sacrifice of the Mass, is no otherwise condemned in the Test, than by presupposing that Rome receives these things in another sense, and practises them in another spirit, than that of the Fathers; which visibly is not so: so that readily, and without alleging further reasons, we may say, that abrogating the Test would be nothing else but abrogating a notorious calumny fixed on the church of Rome.

BOOK XV.

[Variations in the Articles of the Creed: I believe the Holy Catholic Church.—The unshaken steadiness of the Church of Rome.]

A brief Summary.—An account of the Variations relating to the subject of the Church.—She is naturally owned to be Visible.—The difficulty of shewing where the Church was, forced men upon the device of an Invisible one.—The perpetual Visibility of it necessarily confessed.—Divers means of saving the Reformation under this supposition.—The state of the question, as, by the disputes of the Ministers Claude and Jurieu, it stands at present.—They are at length forced to own that salvation may be still had in the Church of Rome, as well as before the pretended Reformation.—Strange Variations, and the Confessions of Faith despised.—Advantages yielded to Catholics on the necessary foundation of Jesus Christ's promises in favour of perpetual Visibility.—The Church owned to be Infallible.—Her sentiments acknowledged to be an infallible rule of Faith.—Vain exceptions.—All the proofs against the infallible authority of the Church brought to nothing by the Ministers.—Evidence and simplicity of the Catholic doctrine with regard to the Church.—The Reformation forsakes her first ground-work, by owning that Faith is not formed on the Scriptures.—Consent of the Ministers Claude and Jurieu on this tenet.—Unheard-of absurdities of the new system concerning the Church, but necessary to defend themselves against the objections of the Catholics.—The uniformity and constancy of the Catholic Church opposed to the Variations of the Protestant Churches.—Abridgment of this fifteenth Book.—Conclusion of the whole Work.

1.—*The cause of Variations, in Protestant Churches, is their want of a true notion of what the Church is.*

As, after observing the pernicious effects of a distemper on man's body, the cause of it is diligently inquired into, in order to apply specific remedies: in like manner, after seeing that perpetual instability of Protestant Churches, (the disastrous distemper of Christendom,) the prime source thereof ought to be traced out, to the end that a suitable relief, if possible, may be afforded. The cause of those variations, which we have observed in separate societies, is their not having known the authority of the Church, the promises she has received from heaven, nor, in short, so much as what the Church is. For that was the fixed point, in which all the steps they were to take ought to centre; and by deviating from this, heretics, either curious or ignorant, have been bewildered in the mazes of human reasoning, abandoned to their resentments, to their particular passions; the very reason they did but walk groping even in their confessions of faith, and could not shun falling under the two inconveniences specified by St. Paul concerning false teachers; one of which is "to be condemned by their own judgment*;" and the other, "to be ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth †."

2.—*The Catholic Church ever knew herself, and never varied in her Decisions.*

This original cause of the instability of the pretended Reformation has appeared through the whole series of this work: but it is time to observe it with particular attention, by shewing, in the confused sentiments of our separated brethren, relating to the article of the Church, the variations which have caused all the rest: after that we shall finish this discourse, by shewing a quite contrary procedure in the Catholic Church, which, from well knowing what she was through the grace of Christ Jesus, has always so well delivered herself at the very first in all questions that arose, in order to ascertain the faith of Christians, that there never happened a necessity, I do not say of varying, but of deliberating anew, or of departing in the least tittle from the first plan.

---

* Tit. iii. 11.

† 2 Tim. iii. 7.

3.—*Doctrine of the Catholic Church concerning the Article of the Church.—Four points essential and inseparable one from the other.*

The doctrine of the Catholic Church consists in four points, whose connexion is inviolable *: the first, that the Church is visible; the second, that she is perpetual; the third, that the truth of the Gospel is always professed therein by the whole society; the fourth, that it is unlawful to depart from her doctrine: which is as much as to say, in other terms, that she is infallible.

The first point is grounded on a certain fact: which is, that the word Church always signifies in Scripture, and, therefore, in the common language of the faithful, a visible society: Catholics take this for granted, and it was necessary for Protestants to assent to it, as will appear hereafter.

The second point, that the Church is perpetual, is not less certain, it being grounded on Jesus Christ's promises agreed on by all parties.

Hence the third point is inferred most clearly, that the truth is professed always by the society of the Church; for the Church being no otherwise visible than by the profession of the truth, it follows, that if she is always, and always is visible, she cannot but always teach and profess the truth of the Gospel: from whence the fourth point is as clearly deduced, that it is not allowable to say the Church is in error, nor to forsake her doctrine; and all this is founded on the promise allowed by all parties, since in fine the same promise, which makes the Church be always, makes her always be in that state which the word Church implies; consequently always visible, and always teaching the truth. Nothing is more simple, more clear, nor more coherent than this doctrine.

4.—*Sentiments of the Protestants touching the perpetual visibility of the Church.—The Confession of Augsburg.*

So clear is this doctrine, that Protestants could not deny it; so clearly does it condemn them, that they durst not own it: wherefore, their whole thoughts were bent on perplexing it, nor were they able to avoid falling into the contradictions I am about to relate.

Let us, in the first place, look into their confessions of faith; and to begin with that of Augsburg †, which is the first, and as it were the foundation of all the rest,—the article concerning the Church was thus delivered by it: "We teach that there is a holy Church which must eternally subsist." What now is that Church whose duration is eternal? The following words explain it: "The Church is the assembly of saints, wherein the Gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered."

---

* Conf. avec M. Cl. p. 13, et seq.

† Conf. Aug. Art. vii.

Here may be seen three fundamental truths. First, "that the Church subsists always:" there is then an inviolate succession. Second, that she is essentially compounded of pastors and people, the administration of the sacraments and preaching of the word entering into her very definition. Third, that the word and sacraments are not only therein administered, but rightly administered, *recte*, "as they ought to be:" which also enters into the essence of a Church, since it is placed, as we see, in her definition.

5.—*This Doctrine owned by Protestants is the subversion of their Reformation, and the source of their perplexities.*

Now, this being admitted, the question is, how they can possibly accuse the Church of error, either in doctrine or in administration of the sacraments; for, could that happen, the definition of the Church wherein is placed not only preaching, but true preaching of the Gospel, and not only administration, but the right administration of the sacraments, would be false; and if that cannot happen, the Reformation, which accused the Church of error, carried in her very title her own condemnation.

Observe well the difficulty: for this was the first source, in the Protestant Churches, of those contradictions we shall discover in them; but contradictions, which the remedies they thought to find for the defect of their original, made them but plunge the deeper into. In the mean while, till the series of facts lead us to these fruitless remedies, let us endeavour thoroughly to make known the evil.

6.—*What it was precisely that the Protestants did oblige themselves to by this Doctrine.*

On this foundation of the seventh article of the Confession of Augsburg, the Lutherans were asked, what it was they came to reform? "The Church of Rome," said they. But have you any other Church wherein the doctrine you would establish is professed? It was a fact incontestable that they could shew none. Where was then that Church, in which, by your seventh article, the true preaching of God's word, and the right administration of the sacraments, were always to subsist? To name some doctors here and there, and from time to time, who, as you pretend, have taught your doctrine, allowing the fact proved, yet would be nothing to the purpose: for it was a body of a Church you were to shew, a body wherein truth was preached, and wherein the sacraments were administered; by consequence, a body compounded of pastors and of people; a body, in this respect, always visible. This is what must be shewn, and, consequently, there must be shewn in this body a manifest succession both of doctrine and of ministry.

7.—*Perpetual Visibility of the Church confirmed by the Apology of the Augsburg Confession.*

At the recital of the seventh article of the Confession of Augsburg, the Catholics found fault with their defining the Church "the assembly of Saints;" and said, that sinners and hypocrites, who are united to the Church by the external bands, ought not to be excluded from their unity. Melancthon accounted for this doctrine in the Apology *, and it is not impossible that might be a dispute as much about words as things; but without stopping at this, let us but observe, they persisted to say † that the Church was always to last, and to last always visible, preaching and the sacraments being essential to her; for let us hear how they speak ‡: "The Catholic Church is not an exterior society of certain nations, but it is men dispersed over all the universe, who have the same sentiments with regard to the Gospel, who have the same Christ, the same Holy Ghost, and the same Sacraments." And still more expressly a little after §, "We never have dreamed that the Church was a Platonic city not to be found on earth; we say that the Church exists, that in it there are true believers, and men truly just spread over all the universe; we add to this, its marks, the pure Gospel, and the Sacraments, and it is such a Church that is properly the pillar of truth." Here, then, at least, unquestionably is a Church very really existing; very really visible, wherein sound doctrine is very really preached, and the Sacraments very really administered as they ought to be; for, as they subjoin, the kingdom of Jesus Christ cannot subsist but with the word and sacraments, so that where they are not, there can be no Church *.

---

* Apol. Tit. de Ecc. p. 144. † Ibid. pp. 145, 146. ‡ Ibid.
§ Ibid. p. 48.

8.—*How it was endeavoured to make this Doctrine consist with the necessity of a Reformation.*

Notwithstanding, many human traditions, said they, had crept into the Church, whereby sound doctrine and the right administration of the sacraments was changed ; and this was what they would reform. But if these human traditions were turned in the Church into articles of faith, where could be that purity of the word and doctrine, without which she could not subsist ? Here the thing was to be palliated, and accordingly they said †, as has been seen, that their design was not to combat against "the Catholic Church, nor even the Church of Rome, nor to maintain opinions which the Church had condemned ;" that the matter in debate was no more than some few abuses brought into the Church without any certain authority ; nor was that to be taken for the doctrine of the Church of Rome, which was approved of only by the Pope, some cardinals, some bishops, and some monks.

To hear the Lutherans speak thus, one might think they did not impugn the received dogmata, but some particular opinions only, and some few abuses lately crept in without authority. This but little suited with those outrageous invectives of sacrilege and idolatry, with which they filled the whole universe, much less with an open rupture. But the fact is certain, and by these smooth words they endeavoured to salve the inconsistency of owning corruption in the tenets of the Church, after having made a pure preaching of the truth essential to her.

9.—*The perpetual Visibility confirmed in the Articles of Smalcald by the promises of Jesus Christ.*

This immutability and perpetual duration of sound doctrine was confirmed in the articles of Smalcald ‡, subscribed by the whole Lutheran party, explaining those words of our Saviour : "On this rock will I build my Church," namely, said they, "on this ministry of the profession made by Peter." Thereunto preaching, and true preaching, was therefore necessary, without which they owned the Church could not subsist.

---

* Apol. Tit. de Ecc. p. 156.

† S. lib. iii. n. 59.

‡ Art. Smal. Concord. p. 345.

10.—*The Saxonic Confession, in which they begin to spy out the difficulty without departing from the precedent doctrine.*

Now we are upon the subject of the doctrine of the Lutheran Churches, the Saxonic Confession, known to be Melancthon's, opportunely presents itself. In it is acknowledged that "there is always some true Church; that the promises of God, who hath promised her duration, are immutable; that they speak not of the Church as of a Platonic idea, but point out a Church which is seen and heard; and that she is visible in this life, and is the assembly which embraces the Gospel of Christ Jesus, and which has the true use of the Sacraments, in which God operates efficaciously by the ministry of the Gospel, and wherein many are regenerated *."

They add, "she may be reduced to a small number; yet, however, there is always a remnant of the faithful, whose voice makes itself be heard on earth, and of which God, from time to time, renews the ministry." They must mean that he continues it; for the definition of the Church which, as just said, cannot subsist without the ministry, does not allow its interruption even for a moment; and immediately after it is subjoined †, "that God will have the ministry of the Gospel be public; he will not have preaching shut up in darkness, but heard by all mankind; and that there are assemblies where it may resound, and where his name may be praised and invoked."

Here then you see the Church always visible. True it is, they begin to see the difficulty, when saying, "she may be reduced to a small number;" but after all, the Lutherans have not less difficulty in shewing, at Luther's first appearance, a small society of their sentiments than a great one, and yet without that there is neither ministry nor Church.

11.—*Doctrine of the Confession of Wirtemburg, and the perpetual Visibility always maintained.*

The Confession of Wirtemburg, which was penned by Brentius, does not degenerate from this doctrine, it being there acknowledged "that there is a Church so well governed by the Holy Ghost, that, although weak, she lasts for ever; that she judges of doctrine; and is where the Gospel is sincerely preached, and where the sacraments are administered according to Christ's institution*." The difficulty still remained of shewing us a Church and a society of pastors and people wherein sound doctrine had always been preserved to Luther's days.

---

* Cap. de Ecc. Syn. Gen. part ii. p. 72.

† Cap. de Cœn. p. 72.

The next chapter relates how councils may err; by reason that, although Jesus Christ has promised his church the perpetual presence of his Holy Spirit, nevertheless, "every assembly is not the Church;" and it may happen in the Church, as in bodies politic, that the greater number of bad men may prevail over the good. This is what I shall not dispute at present; but I still insist on their shewing me a Church, little or great, which, before Luther's coming, was of his sentiments.

12.—*The Confession of Bohemia.*

The Confession of Bohemia is approved by Luther. Therein is confessed† "a Holy and Catholic Church, which comprehends all Christians dispersed throughout all the earth, which are assembled by preaching of the gospel in the faith of the Trinity and of Jesus Christ: wheresoever Jesus Christ is preached and received, and wheresoever are the word and sacraments according to the rule by him prescribed, there is the Church." These men at least were fully satisfied that when they were born there was no Church in the whole universe of their belief‡; for the deputies dispatched by them everywhere on that errand, had well assured them of it. And yet they durst not say their assembly, such as it was, little or great, was the holy, universal Church; but only that "she was a member and a part thereof§." But what then was become of all the other parts? They had surveyed all corners of the world, and no tidings of them: sad extremes indeed! not to dare to say they were the Universal Church, and dare still less to say that they had met with brethren and partners of their faith in any part whatsoever of the whole universe.

Be that as it will, these are the first that seem to insinuate in a Confession of Faith, that true Christian Churches might be separated from one another, since they dare not exclude from Catholic unity, those Churches with whom they knew they had no communion; which I beg may be remarked, by reason that this doctrine will at length be the last resource of Protestants, as shall appear hereafter.

---

* Cap. de Ecc. Ibid. p. 132. Ibid. c. de Conc. p. 134.

† Syn. Gen. Art. viii. p. 186. ‡ S. l. xi. n. 176. § Syn. Gen. p. 187.

13.—*The Confession of Strasburg.*

We have seen the Confession of the Lutherans regarding the Church: we shall now hear the other party. The Confession of Strasburg, presented, as above observed, to Charles V. at the same time with that of Augsburg, defines the Church*, "the society of those who have enlisted themselves soldiers of Jesus Christ, amongst whom are mixed many hypocrites." There is no doubt that such a society is visible—that she must always abide in this state of visibility,—it being added, "that Jesus Christ does never abandon her; that those who do not hear her, ought to be held for heathens and publicans; that, indeed, there is no seeing what constitutes her a Church, namely, her faith; yet she makes herself be seen by her fruits, amongst which confession of the truth is one."

The following chapter sets forth † how that "the Church being on earth in the flesh, God also will instruct her by the exterior word, and make her faithful members preserve an exterior society by means of the sacraments." There are then necessarily both pastors and people, nor can the Church subsist without this ministry.

14.—*Two Confessions of Basil.*

The Confession of Basil in 1536 says ‡, "that the Catholic Church is the holy congregation of all the saints; and although unknown to any but God, nevertheless is she seen, is she known, is she constituted by external rites of God's appointment; to wit, by the sacraments, and by the public and lawful preaching of his word;" wherein is seen manifestly, that ministers lawfully called are comprehended, by whom it is also added, "God makes himself known to his faithful, and administers to them the remission of their sins."

In another Confession of Faith, made at Basil in 1532, "The Christian Church is likewise defined the society of the saints, whereof all those who confess Jesus Christ are the citizens;" thus the profession of Christianity is essential to her.

15.—*The Helvetic Confession of* 1566, *and the perpetual Visibility thoroughly established.*

Whilst we are upon the Helvetic Confessions, that of 1566, which is the great and solemn one, defines also the Church,

---

* Conf. Argent. c. xv. de Eccl. Synt. Gen. part i. p. 191.

† Ibid. cap. xvi.

‡ Ibid. Art. 14, 15.

"which has been always, which is, and which shall ever be, the assembly of the faithful, and of the saints who know God, and serve him by the Word and the Holy Ghost*." Here, then, is not only the interior band, namely, the Holy Ghost, but the exterior also, which is the word and preaching; and therefore they say afterwards, "that lawful and true preaching is her chief mark, to which must be added the sacraments as God has instituted them†." Whence they conclude "that the Churches, which are deprived of these marks, although they boast the succession of their bishops, their unity, and their antiquity, do not belong to the true Church of Jesus Christ; nor can salvation any more be had out of the Church than out of the ark: if you will have life, you must not separate yourself from the true Church of Jesus Christ."

I desire these words may be observed, which will be of main consequence when we shall come to the last answers of the ministers; in the mean time, let us but remark, that it is impossible to teach more clearly that the Church is always visible, and that she is necessarily compounded of pastors and people, than is here done by this Helvetic Confession.

16.—*They begin to vary.—The invisible Church begins to appear.*

But as they were obliged, according to these ideas, always to find a ministry and a Church wherein the truth of Christianity was preserved: the difficulty was no small one, because, say what they would, they were very sensible that there was no Church, little or great, composed of pastors and people, wherein they could shew that faith, which they would make pass for the only true Christian faith. They are then forced to subjoin, "that God has had his friends out of the people of Israel; that, during the captivity of Babylon, the people were deprived sixty years of the sacrifice; that, through a just judgment of God, the truth of his word and worship, and the Catholic faith, are sometimes so obscured, that it seems almost as if they were extinct, and no Church at all subsisting, as happened in the time of Eli and at other times; so that the Church may be called invisible; not that the men she is composed of are so, but because she is often hidden to our eyes, and being known to God alone, escapes from the sight of men." Here is the dogma of an invisible Church, as clearly established as the dogma of the visible Church had been before; that is to say, the Reformation, struck at first with the true notion of the Church, defined it so as that her visibility came into her very essence; but afterwards fell into other notions through the impossibility of finding a Church always visible of her belief.

---

* Syn. Gen. cap. xvii. p. 31. † Ibid. pp. 33, 34.

17.—*Church invisible.—Why invented.—Confession of the Minister Jurieu.*

That it was this inevitable perplexity which drove the Calvinian Churches upon this chimera of a Church invisible none can doubt, after hearing Mr. Jurieu. "That which moved (says he)* some reformed doctors (he should have said whole Churches of the reformation) in their own Confessions of Faith, to cast themselves into the *perplexity* they were entangled in upon their denying the perpetual visibility of the Church, was because they believed, by owning the Church always visible, they should find it difficult to answer the question which the Church of Rome so often makes us:—Where was our Church a hundred and fifty years ago? If the Church be always visible, your Calvinist and Lutheran Church is not the true Church, for that was not visible." This is fairly owning the cause of that perplexity which disturbed his Churches: he that pretends to have refined beyond them, will not extricate himself better, as we shall see; but let us continue to observe the confusion of the Churches themselves.

18.—*Belgic Confession, and sequel of the perplexity.*

The Belgic Confession manifestly copies after the Helvetic, since it says†, "that the Catholic or Universal Church is the assembly of all the faithful; that she has been, is, and will be eternally, by reason that Jesus Christ, her eternal King, cannot be without subjects: although for some time she seem little, *and as it were extinct* to the eyes of men; as in the time of Achab and of those seven thousand who had not bent their knees to Baal."

Nevertheless, they afterwards subjoin‡, "That the Church is the assembly of the elect, out of which none can be saved; that it is not lawful to withdraw from her, or abide apart: but all must unite themselves to the Church, and submit to her discipline§; that one may see and know her, by pure preaching, right administration of the sacraments, and a good discipline; and it is thereby, say they, that we may rightly distinguish this true Church, from which it is not allowable to depart."

---

* Syst. p. 226. † Syn. Gen. Art. 27, p. 140. ‡ Ibid. Art. 28.
§ Ibid. Art. 29.

It seems, then, on one side, as if they would say, one may easily and always know her, since she has such manifest tokens, and that it is never lawful to depart from her. And on the other side, if we press them to shew us a Church of their belief, though never so minute, always visible, they provide a subterfuge for themselves by flying to this Church which does not appear, although they dare not speak out boldly, nor say absolutely that she is extinct, but only that she seems as it were extinct.

19.—*Church of England.*

The Church of England speaks ambiguously. "The visible Church (says she *) is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments are duly ministered, according to Christ's ordinance;" that is, such is she when visible, but this is not saying that she is always visible. What follows is not more clear: "As the Churches of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred in matters of faith:" the question is, (they thus attainting these great, and as it were, mother Churches of all the rest,) whether the infection might have spread so universally, as that the profession of truth was extinguished over all the earth; but they chose rather to speak nothing of it, than to incur this terrible dilemma, which would oblige them, on one side, either to own there was no Church left on earth in which truth was confessed: or, allowing the impossibility of this, would oblige them, on the other side, to seek what they knew could not be found, to wit, a Church always subsisting and believing as they did.

20.—*Confession of Scotland, and manifest contradiction.*

In the Confession of Scotland, the Catholic Church is defined the Society of all the Elect: they say †, "She is invisible, and known to God only, who alone knows his elect;" and add, "that the true Church hath for its mark, preaching and the sacraments:" and wherever these marks be, though there should be but two or three men, there is the Church of Jesus Christ, in the midst of which he is, according to his promise; "Which is understood (say they) not of the universal Church just spoken of, but of the particular Church of Ephesus, of

---

* Syn. Gen. Art. 19, p. 103.

† Ibid. Art. 16, de Eccl. p. 118, Art. 18, p. 119.

Corinth, and so forth, wherein the ministry had been planted by St. Paul." Prodigious! to make Jesus Christ say the ministry may be where two or three men can be found. But they were forced into these straits; for to find one only Church of their belief, wherein was a regulated ministry, as at Ephesus or Corinth, always subsisting, was what they despaired of.

21.—*Catechism of the pretended Reformed of France.*

I have reserved the Confession of the pretended Reformed of France for the last, not only on account of the particular concern I ought to have for my own country, but also because in France especially the Protestants have for this long time sought most diligently for the solution of this difficulty.

Let us begin by the Catechism*, wherein on the fifteenth Sunday, upon this Article of the Creed, "I believe the Holy Catholic Church," they teach, that this name is given her, "to signify that as there is but one head of the faithful, so all are to be united in one body; so that there are not many Churches, but one only, which is diffused all the world over." How the Lutheran or Calvinian Church was diffused all the world over, when scarce known in some corner of it; and, how Churches of this belief are to be found, in all times and in all the world, is what constitutes the difficulty. They saw, and obviate it in the following Sunday †, where, after having asked, whether this Church may be otherwise known than by believing her, they answer thus: "There is indeed a visible Church of God conformable to the signs he hath given us to know her by; but in this place (the Creed), properly speaking, is meant the society of those whom God hath elected for salvation, which cannot be discovered fully by the eye."

22.—*Sequel in which the difficulty appears.—The Church in the Creed at length acknowledged visible.*

They seem to say two things: the first, that no mention is made of the Church in the symbol of the Apostles; the second, that for want of such a Church which they might shew visibly of their belief, it is sufficient to have recourse to that invisible Church which cannot be seen fully by the eye. But what follows puts an obstacle to the two points of this doctrine, it being there taught, "that no man obtains pardon of his sins, unless he be first incorporated with God's people, and persevere in unity and communion with the body of Christ, and so be a member of the Church:" whence they conclude, that "out of the Church there is nothing but death and damnation; and that all those who separate themselves from the company of the faithful to make a sect apart, ought not, whilst divided, to hope salvation." To make a sect apart, is, unquestionably, to break the exterior bonds of the Church's unity. They suppose, therefore, that the Church, wherewith it is necessary to be in communion in order to obtain pardon of our sins, has a two-fold union, the internal and external; and that both of them are necessary, first to salvation, and secondly to the understanding the Article of the Creed touching the Catholic Church: so that this Church, confessed in the Creed, is visible and distinguishable in her exterior; for which reason also they durst not venture to say that we could not see her, but, could not see her fully, to wit, as to that which is internal; a thing no man disputes.

---

* Catech. Dim. xv.

† Dim. xvi.

23.—*Calvin's sentiment.*

All these notions in the Catechism came from Calvin who composed it: for, explaining the Article, "I believe the Catholic Church*," he distinguishes the Church visible from the invisible known to God alone, which is the society of all the elect, and it seems as if he would say it is this the Creed speaks of: although, says he†, "this Article regards, in some measure, the external Church," as if they were two Churches, and it were not, on the contrary, most evident, that the same Church, which is invisible in her internal gifts, doth manifest herself by the sacraments and profession of her faith. But so it is, that the Reformation is always in a panic when the Church's visibility is to be acknowledged.

24.—*Confession of Faith of the French Calvinists.*

They act more naturally in their Confession of Faith, and elsewhere it hath been proved unanswerably, that they there own no other Church but that which is visible‡. The fact stands incontestable, as will be seen hereafter. Nor was there, indeed, anything that could less bear a dispute; for, from the twenty-fifth Article, where this matter begins, to the thirty-second Article, where it ends, they all along evidently suppose the Church visible; and in the twenty-fifth Article, they lay it down as a fundamental point, that "the

---

* Instit. l. iv. c. 1. n. 2. † N. 3. ‡ Conf. avec M. Cl. p. 9, et seq.

Church cannot subsist, unless there be pastors in her that have the charge of teaching." It is, therefore, a thing absolutely necessary; and those who oppose this doctrine are detested as fantastical. Whence they conclude, in the twenty-sixth Article, "that no man ought to withdraw apart, nor rest on self-sufficiency;" so that it is necessary to be united externally with some Church: a truth inculcated in every place, without the appearance of so much as one word of a Church invisible.

It ought, however, to be observed, that in the twenty-sixth Article, where it is said, "No man ought to withdraw apart nor rest on self-sufficiency, but should join himself to some Church," they add, "and this in whatever place God shall have established a true form of a Church;" whereby it is left undecided whether or no they mean that such a form always does subsist.

25.—*Sequel, wherein the perpetual Visibility is always manifestly supposed.*

In the twenty-seventh Article caution is given to distinguish carefully which is the true Church; words that plainly shew they suppose her visible: and after having decided that she is "the congregation of true, faithful men," they add, "amongst the faithful there be hypocrites and reprobate, whose wickedness cannot deface the title of a Church," wherein the Church's visibility is again clearly supposed.

26.—*The Church of Rome excluded from the title of a true Church by the twenty-eighth Article of the French Confession.*

By the principles laid down in the twenty-eighth Article, the Church of Rome stands excluded from the title of a true Church, forasmuch as, after laying this foundation, "that, where the word of God is not preached, and no profession is made of bringing one's self under subjection to it, and where there is no use of sacraments, properly speaking, we cannot judge that there is any Church:" they declare they "condemn the assemblies of the Papacy, considering that the pure truth of God is banished thence, and the sacraments are there corrupted, adulterated, falsified, or wholly annihilated; and all superstitions and idolatries are in vogue amongst them:" whence they draw this consequence,—"We hold that all those who join in such deeds, and communicate in them, do separate and cut themselves off from the body of Christ Jesus."

It is impossible to decide more clearly that there is no salvation in the Church of Rome. And what is subjoined by them, that there are still some "footsteps of a Church amongst us," so far from mitigating the precedent expressions, even strengthens them; inasmuch as this term implies rather some remains and traces of a Church that had formerly passed that way, than a token of her being there. Thus was it understood by Calvin, when he asserted* "that the essential doctrine of Christianity was entirely forgotten by us." But the difficulty of discovering a society in which God could be served, before the Reformation, has made them elude this article, as we shall see hereafter.

27.—*The thirty-first Article, in which the interruption of the Ministry, and the cessation of the visible Church, is acknowledged.*

The same reason obliged them also to elude the thirty-first, which regards the vocation of Ministers. However trite may have been this subject, it must nevertheless, of necessity, be resumed, and so much the more, as it has given occasion to notorious variations even in our days. It begins by these words:—"We believe (it is an article of faith, consequently revealed by God, and revealed clearly in his Scripture according to the principles of the Reformation), we believe, then, that no man may intrude himself, of his own proper authority, into the government of the Church;" allowed, the thing is certain: "but that this ought to be done by election;" this part of the Article is not less certain than the other. You must be chosen, deputed, authorized, by somebody; otherwise you are an intruder, "and by your own particular authority," the thing just now prohibited. But here is what annoys the Reformation; they knew not who had chosen, deputed, authorised the Reformers, and it was necessary to find out here some cloak for so visible a defect. Wherefore, after having said you ought to be elected and deputed after some form or other, without specifying any, they add, "so far forth as is possible, and God permits it:" whereby an exception is manifestly prepared in behalf of the Reformers. And, accordingly, they immediately subjoin, "which exception we add expressly, because it hath been necessary sometimes, nay, in our days, when the state of the Church was interrupted, that God should raise men in an extraordinary manner to set up the Church anew which was fallen into ruin and desolation." They could not denote in more clear and more general terms the interruption of the ordinary ministry established by God, nor carry it further than to be obliged to have recourse to an extraordinary mission which God himself dispatches, and accordingly furnishes with the particular proofs of his immediate will. For they acknowledge frankly in the present case, that they can neither produce pastors that did consecrate, nor people that could elect; which implied necessarily the entire extinction of the Church in her visibility; and remarkable it was that, from the interruption of the visibility and ministry, they came to own in plain terms that the Church was fallen into ruin, without distinguishing the visible from the invisible, because they had got into a train of simple notions by which the Scripture naturally leads us to own no Church but such as is visible.

---

* Instit. iv. c. xi. n. 2.

28.—*Perplexity in the Synods of Gap and Rochelle, on account that the invisible Church had been forgotten in the Confession.*

This difficulty was at length perceived by the Reformation; and in 1603, five and forty years after the Confession of Faith had been published, was proposed to the national synod of Gap in these terms*: "The provinces are exhorted to examine thoroughly, in the provincial synods, in what terms the twenty-fifth Article of the Confession of Faith ought to be couched, so much the more as our belief, regarding the Church, whereof mention is made in the creed, being to be expressed, there is nothing in the said confession that can be understood of any other than the church militant and visible." A general command is subjoined, "that all come prepared on questions concerning the Church."

This is, therefore, a fact well avowed, that when they were to expound the doctrine of the Church, an article so essential to Christianity as to have been expressed in the creed, the idea of a Church invisible did not so much as enter into the minds of the Reformers, so distant was it from good sense, and so unnatural. However, they bethink themselves afterwards that it is necessary for their turn, it being impossible for them to find out a Church which had always visibly persisted in the faith they profess, and a remedy is therefore sought for this omission. What shall they say? That the

---

* Synod. de Gap. ch. de la Conf. de Foi.

Church might be wholly invisible? This were introducing into a Confession of Faith so crude a fancy, so repugnant to good sense, that it never entered into the heads of those that drew it up. It was therefore resolved, at last, to leave it as they found it; and four years after, in 1607, at the national synod of Rochelle*, when all the provinces had thoroughly examined what was wanting to the Confession of Faith, "they concluded not to add to or diminish anything from the twenty-fifth and twenty-ninth Articles," the very same in which the visibility of the Church was expressed the most fully, "nor to meddle anew with the subject of the Church."

29.—*Vain subtlety of the Minister Claude towards eluding these Synods.*

Mr. Claude, of all men, was the most subtle to elude the decisions of his Church when they incommoded him†; but, on this occasion, he jests but too openly, for he would make us believe that all the difficulty the Synod of Gap met with in the Confession of Faith, was, that she could have wished that, instead of specifying only "the militant and visible part of the universal Church, her invisible parts, which are the Church triumphant and that which is still to come, had also been specified." Was not that, indeed, a very important, a very difficult question, to order the discussion of in all the synods and over all the provinces, towards bringing it to a decision in the next national synod? Did they so much as dream of ever raising so frivolous a question? And to believe they troubled their heads about it, must not he have forgotten the whole state of controversies ever since the beginning of the pretended Reformation? But Mr. Claude was not for acknowledging that the synod's perplexity proceeded from her not finding, in their Confession of Faith, the invisible Church, whilst his brother, Mr. Jurieu, more sincere in that particular, agrees that they thought it was necessary in the party, in order to answer the query, Where was the Church?

30.—*Remarkable decision, which they stick not to, of the Synod of Gap, concerning extraordinary Vocation.*

The same Synod of Gap passed an important decision on the thirty-first article of the Confession of Faith, which spoke of the extraordinary vocation of pastors: for the question being proposed, "Whether or no it were expedient, when they should treat on the vocation of pastors who reformed the Church, to ground the authority they had to reform and teach, on the vocation they had received from the Church of Rome;" the Synod judged "they ought to refer it, according to the article, to the extraordinary vocation only whereby God interiorly stirred them up to this ministry, and not to the small remains amongst them of that corrupted ordinary vocation." Such was the decision of the Synod of Gap: but, as before frequently observed, the Reformation never hits right at first. Whereas, she enjoins here to have recourse to an extraordinary vocation only, the Synod of Rochelle says they must principally have recourse to it. But they will no more abide by the exposition of the Synod of Rochelle, than by the determination of the Synod of Gap; and the whole sense of the article, so carefully explained by two Synods, shall be changed by two ministers.

---

* Syn. de la Roch. 1607.

† Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. p. 220.

31.—*The Ministers elude the Decree concerning extraordinary Vocation.*

The ministers Claude and Jurieu are no longer for an extraordinary vocation by which ministers are sent immediately from God; neither does a confession of faith, nor Synods, terrify them: for as the Reformed in the main neither care for confessions of faith nor synods, and answer objections from them only for form-sake, even the slightest evasions will serve their turn. For such, Mr. Claude was never at a loss; "the right to teach (says he) and to perform the pastoral functions, is one thing: the right to labour towards a reformation, is another*." As for the last, the vocation was extraordinary, on account of the extraordinary talents the Reformers were endowed with: but there was nothing extraordinary as for the vocation to the pastoral ministry, since these first pastors were appointed by the people, in whom the source of authority and vocation naturally resides †.

32.—*Extraordinary Vocation, established in the Confession and two national Synods, is abandoned.*

They could not shift off the thirty-first Article in a more gross manner. For, it is manifest the question there regarded in no manner of way either the extraordinary labour towards a reformation, or the rare talents wherewith the Reformers were endowed; but merely the vocation for governing the Church, into which it was not lawful "for any one to intrude himself of his own proper authority." Now it was in this regard that they had recourse to an extraordinary vocation; consequently, it was in regard of the pastoral functions.

---

* Def. de la Rep. p. i. ch. iv. et p. iv. ch. iv. Rep. à M. de Cond. pp. 313, 333.

† Ibid. pp. 307, 313.

The Synod explains itself no less clearly: for without the least thought of distinguishing between the power of reforming and that of teaching, which in reality are so linked together, that the same power which authorizes to teach, authorizes likewise to reform abuses,—the question was, whether the power, as well of reforming as of teaching, ought to be founded on vocation derived from the Church of Rome, or on an extraordinary commission issuing immediately from God; and the Synod concludes for the latter.

But no longer were there any means left of maintaining it, they not having any one mark thereof: nay, two Synods could find no other warrant to authorize these extraordinary commissioned pastors, except what they said for themselves, that they had an "interior impulse to their ministry." The chiefs of the Anabaptists and Unitarians say the same, nor is there a more sure method of introducing into the pastoral charge all manner of fanatics.

33.—*How important is the present state of the controversy about the Church.*

Here was a fine field opened to Catholics. Nor have they been failing so to press the arguments regarding the Church and ministry, that intestine divisions began to disorder the camp of the enemy; and the minister Claude, after subtilizing to a higher pitch than any one had ever done before him, was not able to content the minister Jurieu. What they both have said on this subject, the steps they have taken towards the truth, the absurdities they fell into for not having sufficiently pursued their principle, have placed the question concerning the Church in such a state as not to be dissembled without omitting one of the most material occurrences of this history.

34.—*They no longer contest with us the Church's Visibility.*

These two ministers suppose the Church visible, and always visible, nor is it in this point they are divided. In order to put it beyond all doubt that Mr. Claude persisted in this sentiment to the very last, I will produce the last work of his on this subject. He there declares *, that the question between Catholics and Protestants is not whether the Church be visible; that it is not denied in his religion that the true Church of Jesus Christ, the Church which his promises relate to, is so; he very clearly decides that the text of St. Paul, in which the Church is represented as without spot or wrinkle, "regards not only the Church in heaven, but also the visible Church that is on earth: insomuch, that the visible Church is the body of Christ Jesus, or, what comes to the same thing, the body of Christ Jesus, which alone is the true Church, is visible: that this is the sentiment of Calvin and Mestresat, and that the Church of God is not to be sought out of the visible state of the ministry and world."

35.—*The promises of Jesus Christ in behalf of the Visibility are allowed.*

This is most clearly owning that she cannot subsist without her visibility and the perpetuity of her ministry: accordingly this author has acknowledged it in many places, and particularly in expounding these words: the "gates of hell shall not prevail against her;" where he speaks thus †: "if in these words be understood a perpetual subsistence of the ministry in a state sufficient for the salvation of God's elect, in spite of all the efforts of hell, and in spite of all the disorders and confusions of the ministers themselves; it is no more than what I own has been promised by Jesus Christ, and therein it is that we have a sensible and palpable token of his promise."

The perpetuity, therefore, of the ministry is not a thing which happens accidentally to the Church, or is only suitable to her for a time; it is a thing which is promised her by Jesus Christ himself; and it is equally certain, that the Church will never be without a visible ministry, as it is certain that Jesus Christ is the eternal truth.

36.—*Another promise equally confessed.*

This Minister proceeds still further ‡, and expounding this promise of Jesus Christ, "Go ye, baptize, teach, and lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world," he approves this comment thereon: "with you teaching, with you baptizing," and concludes it with these words: "I acknowledge that Jesus Christ promises the Church to be with her, and to teach with her, *without interruption*, to the world's end:" an acknowledgment from whence I shall, in due time, conclude the infallibility of the Church's doctrine, with whom Jesus Christ is always teaching: but I only employ it here to establish by his scriptures and his promises, with the consent of this Minister, the visible perpetuity of the Church-ministry.

---

* Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. p. 73. Ib. pp. 82, 83, et seq.

† Ibid. p. 105. Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ Conf. avec. M. Cl. p. 36. Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. pp. 106, 107.

37.—*The Visibility enters into the definition which the Minister Claude has given of the Church.*

Accordingly, also, he proceeds thus to define the Church: "the Church is (says he) the true faithful who make profession of the truth, of Christian piety, of a true sanctity under a ministry which furnishes her with the food necessary for a spiritual life, without subtracting from her any part thereof*." Where the profession of the truth and the perpetuity of the visible ministry are seen manifestly to enter the definition of the Church: whence it clearly follows, that as much as he is assured that she will always exist, so much is he assured that she always will be visible, since visibility appertains to her essence, and comes into her very definition.

38.—*In what manner the Society of the faithful is visible, in this Minister's opinion.*

If it be asked this minister, how he understands the Church to be visible, since he will have her be the assembly of the true faithful known to God alone, and that the profession of the truth, which might make her known, is common to her with wicked men and hypocrites, as well as the visible and exterior ministry; he answers †, that it is sufficient to render the assembly of the faithful visible, that we may point at the place where she abides, to-wit, the body wherein she is nourished, and the visible ministry under which she is necessarily contained: by which means we may even say, "there she is," as, viewing the field in which grow good corn and tares, we say, "there is the good corn;" and as, beholding the nets wherein are good and bad fish, "there are the good fish."

---

* Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. p. 119.

† Ibid. pp. 79, 95, 115, 121, 146, 243.

39.—*Before the Reformation, the Elect of God saved in the Communion, and under the Ministry of Rome.*

But what was that public and visible ministry under which were contained, before the Reformation, the true faithful whom he will have alone to be the true Church? this was the grand question. No ministry was to be found throughout the whole universe that had perpetually continued, except that of the Church of Rome, or of others, whose doctrine was equally disadvantageous to Protestants. Wherefore he was obliged at last to own, that "this body in which the true faithful were nourished, and this ministry whereby they received sufficient food without subtraction of any part, was the body of the Church of Rome, and the ministry of her prelates[*]."

40.—*This Minister has not recourse to the Albigenses, &c.*

This Minister is here to be praised for his penetration, exceeding that of many others, and for not having confined the Church to societies separate from Rome, as were the Vaudois and Albigenses, the Wickliffites and the Hussites: for though he considers them as the most "illustrious part of the Church, because they were the most pure, the most knowing, and the most generous[†];" he well saw it was ridiculous there to place the whole defence of his cause; and in his last work, without minding these obscure sects, whose insufficiency is now made visible, he no where places the true Church and true faithful but in the Latin ministry.

41.—*Inevitable perplexity and contradiction.*

But here lies the dilemma, which it is impossible to evade; for the Catholics return to their old query: if the true Church be always visible; if the marks to know her by, according to all your catechisms and all your confessions of faith, be the pure preaching of the Gospel, and the right administration of the Sacraments, either the Church of Rome had these two marks, and you came in vain to reform her, or she had them not; and you can no longer say, according to your principles, that she is the body in which is contained the true Church. For, in contradiction to this, Calvin has said[‡], "that the doctrine essential to Christianity was there buried, and she was nothing but a school of idolatry and impiety." His sentiments passed into the Confession of Faith, wherein we have seen*, " that the pure truth of God was banished from this Church ; that the sacraments were there corrupted, falsified, and adulterated ; that all superstition and idolatry were there in vogue." Whence he concluded, " that the Church was fallen into desolation and ruin, the state of the ministry interrupted, and her succession so annihilated, that there was no means of reviving it but by an extraordinary mission." And, in reality, if imputed justice was the foundation of Christianity; if the merit of works, and so many other received doctrines, were mortally ruinous to piety ; if both kinds were essential to the Eucharist, where was the truth and sacraments? Calvin and the confession were in the right to say, according to these principles, that no Church at all was left amongst us.

---

[*] Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. pp. 130, &c. 145, &c. 360, &c. 369, &c. 373, 378.

[†] Def. de la Rep. p. iii. ch. v. p. 289. Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond.

[‡] Inst. l. iv. c. ii. n. 2. S. n. 26.

42.—*The answers whereby they fall into a greater perplexity*†.

On the other side, neither can it be said that the Church has ceased, nor ceased to be visible : the promises of Jesus Christ are too perspicuous, and reconciled they must be, some way or other, with the doctrine of the Reformation. Hence commenced the distinction of additions and subtractions : if by subtraction you take away some fundamental truths, no longer stands the ministry : if you lay evil dogmata on these foundations; nay, though they should destroy this foundation by consequence, the ministry subsists, impure indeed, yet sufficient: and by the discernment which the faithful make of the foundation, which is Jesus Christ, from that which is superadded, they shall find all necessary nourishment in the ministry. Here then ends that purity of doctrine, and of sacraments rightly administered, which had been set as marks of the true Church. Without having so much as preaching which you can approve of, or worship which you can join in, or an entire Eucharist, still you have all necessary food without subtraction of any part thereof, still you have the purity of the word, and the sacraments well administered : what is it to contradict one's self, if this be not ?

---

* Inst. l. iv. c. ii. n. 2. S. n. 26.

† Rep. de M. Cl. au Disc. de M. de Meaux, pp. 128, 149, 146, 247, 561, &c.

43.—*According to the Minister's principles all is entire in the Church of Rome that can be required for eternal Salvation.*

But here occurs another difficulty. If together with all these points of doctrine, all these practices, and all this worship of the Church of Rome, with the adoration and oblation of our Saviour's body, with the subtraction of one kind, and all the other dogmata, you have still "all necessary food without subtraction of any part," because one God is by her confessed, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and one only Jesus Christ as God and Saviour; it is, therefore, to be had there still: still you have in her the marks of a true Church, namely, purity of doctrine, and the right administration of the sacraments to a sufficient degree: still then the true Church is there, and still therein may you save your soul.

44.—*No difference between us and our fathers.*

To this Mr. Claude would not agree; the consequences of so considerable a concession made him tremble for the Reformation. But Mr. Jurieu did not mince the matter, sensible as he was that the differences which Mr. Claude alleged between us and our fathers were too frivolous to boggle at. And, indeed, no more than these two were mentioned: the first is, that at present there is a body whose communion we may embrace, viz. the body of the pretended Reformed: the second is, that the Church of Rome has made many dogmata articles of faith, which, in our fathers' time, were undecided*. But nothing can be more frivolous; and to convince the Minister Claude, he needs only to remember what the Minister Claude has but just told us: viz. that the Berengarians, the Vaudois, the Albigenses, the Wickliffites, the Hussites, &c. had already appeared in the world as "the most illustrious part of the Church, because they were the most pure, the most knowing, the most generous †." Again, he has but to remember that, even in his judgment, the Church of Rome "had already given cause sufficient of withdrawing from her communion by her anathematisms against Berengarius, against the Vaudois and Albigenses, against John Wickliff and John Huss, and by the persecutions she had exercised against them ‡." Yet he owns, nevertheless, in all these places, that, in order to salvation, it was not necessary to join with these sects, and that Rome did still contain the elect of God.

---

* Def. de la Ref. p. 265. Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. pp. 370, 358, &c.

† Def. de la Ref. p. iii. ch. v. p. 289.

‡ Rep. au Disc. de Cond. p. 368.

To say that the Lutherans and Calvinists outshone them in brightness and lustre, were only disputing about more or less, the substance of the thing still continuing the same. The decisions, passed against these sects, comprehended the principal part of what afterwards was defined against Luther and Calvin; and without speaking of decisions, the constant and universal practice of offering the sacrifice of the Mass, and making the most essential part of the divine worship to consist in this oblation, was no new thing, nor was it possible to remain in the Church without consenting to this worship. We had, therefore, with this worship, and with all its dependencies, all necessary food, without subtraction of any part thereof: therefore we may still have it; Mr. Claude could not have denied this without too gross an imposition, nor was the concession of it, lately made by Mr. Jurieu, otherwise than forced.

Add to this that Mr. Claude, who would make us believe so great a difference betwixt the times preceding and those subsequent to the Reformation, under pretext that doctrines before undecided, are since made articles of faith, has himself destroyed this answer, by saying*, " that it was not a more difficult thing to the people to abstain from believing and practising what had been made a dogma, than to abstain from believing and practising what was taught by the ministry, what was commanded by it, and what was become common;" so that this mighty matter of making new Dogmata, which he sets up for such a scarecrow to his party, after all, is just nothing even in his own judgment.

45.—*Falsehood asserted by the Minister Claude, that one might be in the Romish Communion without communicating in her Dogmata and Practice.*

To these inconsistencies of Mr. Claude's doctrine, I add also a palpable falsehood which he was bound to maintain by this system, *viz.* that the true faithful, whom he owns in the Church of Rome before the Reformation, " therein subsisted without communicating in her doctrines, or her corrupted practices†;" that is to say, without coming to Mass, without confessing themselves, without communicating all their lives, or at death; in a word, without ever performing any one action of a Roman Catholic.

---

* Rep. au Disc. de M. de Cond. p. 357.

† Ibid. pp. 360, 361, &c. 369, &c.

He has been made to see, a hundred times, what a new prodigy this would be; for without speaking of the great care that was taken through the entire Church to make inquiries after the Vaudois and Albigenses, the Wickliffites and Hussites, it is certain, in the first place, that even those, whose doctrine was unsuspected, were obliged, on a hundred occasions, to shew tokens of their belief, and particularly when the holy Viaticum was given them. We need but look into all the rituals antecedent to Luther's times, to be convinced of the care then taken to make those to whom they administered it, first confess their sins, and in giving it to them, to make them own therein the truth of the body of our Lord, and adore it with a profound respect. A second incontestable fact results from thence: which is, that the concealed Vaudois and others, who wished to shelter themselves from the censures of the Church, had no other means of compassing it, than by practising the same worship with the Catholics, even by receiving communion with them*: this has been most clearly shewn by all kinds of proofs that can be had in such a matter. But there is a third and still more certain fact, inasmuch as it is acknowledged even by the ministers, *viz.* that of all those who embraced either Lutheranism or Calvinism, not so much as one has been found to say, that in embracing such doctrines he did not change his belief, but only declared what he always had believed in his heart.

46.—*A certain fact, that before the Reformation, the Doctrine she taught was unknown.—Reflection on a book of Mr. Claude, after the conference of this Minister.*

To this fact distinctly stated, Mr. Claude is satisfied with answering insultingly, "Does M. de Meaux imagine that the disciples of Luther and Zuinglius ought to have made formal declarations of all they had thought before the Reformation, or that these declarations ought to appear publicly in print†?"

This is shuffling in too weak and palpable a manner, for I did not pretend that all ought to be declared, or all printed; but that they never would have omitted to write that which decided one of the most material points of the whole cause, namely, the question, whether or no, before Luther and Zuinglius, there was any one person of their faith, or whether their faith then was absolutely unknown. This question was decisive, since none being able to conceive that the truth had been wholly extinguished, it followed manifestly that what doctrine soever was undiscoverable then on earth, could not be the truth. Examples would have cleared all kind of doubt on this matter, and if any had been, it is evident they would have made them public, but they produced none; it is therefore because there were none, and the fact must stand as incontestable.

---

* Sup. l. xi. n. 106, 107, 117, 149, &c.

† Rep. au disc. de M. de Cond. p. 460.

47.—*Whether Luther's quick success be a proof, that before his disputes men thought as he did.*

All that could be answered to this was, that had men been satisfied with the doctrines and worship of Rome, the Reformation would not have met with so speedy a success*. But, not to repeat here what may be found elsewhere, with regard to this success, and even throughout this whole history, it is sufficient to reflect on that saying of St. Paul, "That the word of heretics will spread like to a gangrene†:" now the gangrene does not suppose a gangrene in the body it corrupts, nor by consequence do Heresiarchs find their error already settled in those minds which it depraves. It is true matters were disposed‡, as Mr. Claude says, by ignorance and other above-mentioned causes, for the most part little to the credit of the Reformation: but to conclude from thence with this minister, that the disciples, whom novelty gained to Luther, were already of his sentiments, is, instead of a positive fact whereof proof is demanded, substituting a consequence that is not only doubtful, but even evidently false.

48.—*Absurdity of Mr. Claude's supposition, with respect to those who, in his judgment, lived in the Communion of Rome.*

Again, though it were granted Mr. Claude, that before the Reformation all men were asleep in the Church of Rome, even so far as to let every man act as he pleased; those that were neither present at Mass nor Communion, that never confessed their sins, never partook of the sacraments, either living or dying, lived and died quite undisturbed: none ever dreamed of requiring from such people a confession of their faith, and reparation of the scandal they had given to their brethren: after all, what does he gain by advancing such prodigies? His drift therein was to prove men might have saved their souls whilst remaining with sincerity in communion with the Church of Rome. In proof of this, the first thing he does, is to take from those he saves all the exterior bands of communion. The most essential part of the service was the Mass: they were to take no part in it. The most manifest token of communion, was communicating at Easter: they were to abstain from it; otherwise they must have adored Jesus Christ as present, and partook but of one kind. All pulpits resounded with this worship, with this communion, and, in fine, with these doctrines deemed so corrupt. Great heed was to be taken not to give the least sign of approving them; by this means, says Mr. Claude, salvation might be had in communion with the Church. He ought rather to have concluded, that by this means salvation would be had out of communion with the Church, since by this means such would have violated all the ties of communion; for, in short, let them define to me what it is to be in communion with a Church. Is it to dwell in the country where this Church is owned, as Protestants did amongst us, and Catholics do now in England and Holland? Surely it cannot be that; but perhaps it is to appear in the churches, to hear the sermons, and be present at the assemblies without any token of approbation, and much in the same disposition with a curious traveller, without saying "amen" to their prayers, and especially without ever communicating! This is bantering, you will reply. Why, then, to communicate with a church, is at least to frequent her meetings with the marks of consent and approbation given thereto by others. To give these marks to a Church whose profession of faith is criminal, is giving consent to a crime; and refusing them, is no longer being in that exterior communion, wherein, nevertheless, you would have them be.

---

* Rep. au disc. de M. de Cond. p. 363. Rep. à la Let. Past. de M. de Meaux.

† 2 Tim. ii. 17.

‡ Ibid.

But if you say, the marks of approbation to be given must only fall on the truths which this Church preaches, and on the good she practises, by the same way of reasoning, one might be in communion with the Socinians, with the Deists could they make one society, with the Mahometans, with the Jews, by receiving the several truths professed in each party, silent as to all the rest, and living withal in every respect a complete Socinian, a complete Deist: what extravagance can compare with this?

49.—*This Minister varies in what he had said of the Church's Visibility.*

This is the state wherein Mr. Claude has left the controversy regarding the Church; a weak state, as is plain, and manifestly indefensible. And, indeed, he does not trust to it, nor will he deprive his party of the subterfuge, though never so pitiful, of an invisible Church, since he supposes God may make his Church entirely vanish out of the sight of men*: and when he says he may, he does not mean that he can do this absolutely speaking, and it implies no contradiction, for that is not the question; nor are metaphysical abstractions here so much as thought of; but he may do it in the hypothesis, and allowing the present plan of Christianity. It is in this sense that Mr. Claude decides, "That God may, when he pleases, reduce the faithful to an entire external dispersion, and preserve them in this miserable state, and that there is great difference between saying, the Church ceases to be visible, and saying, the Church ceases to be." After a hundred times repeating, that he disputes not with us the Church's visibility†; after making the visibility of her ministry enter into her very definition; after grounding her perpetuity on these promises of Jesus Christ, "Lo, I am with you always, and the gates of hell shall not prevail,"—to say what we have just heard, is to forget his own doctrine, and make void the promises which are more durable than heaven and earth. But his case was this: after his utmost straining to reconcile them with his Reformation, and to maintain the Scripture doctrine of the visibility, he found it still requisite to leave himself a last refuge in the invisible Church, to fly to in case of need.

50.—*The Minister Jurieu comes in to the assistance of the Minister Claude, who had involved himself in an inextricable labyrinth.*

In this posture was the question, when Mr. Jurieu published his new system of the Church‡. No means were there of defending the difference which his brother would have placed between us and our forefathers, nor of saving one in damning the others. No less ridiculous was it, in owning that some elect are born to God, in the communion of the Church of Rome, to say, that these elect of her communion were such as took no part in her doctrine, nor in her worship, nor in her sacraments. Mr. Jurieu was very sensible that these pretended elect could be nothing but hypocrites or impious men; and at length, though with much ado, he opened Heaven's gate to those who lived in the communion of the Church of Rome. But lest she might glory in this advantage, he communicated it, at the same time, to all other Churches wheresoever Christianity is spread, how much soever divided amongst themselves, though never so unmercifully excommunicating one another.

---

* Def. de la Rep. pp. 47, 49, 314. Rep. au disc. de M. de Cond. pp. 89, 92, 245, 247.

† P. 63, et seq.

‡ Syst. de l'Egl. l. i. ch. xx. xxi., &c.

51.—*He establishes Salvation in all Communions.*

He carried this notion to such a height, that he did not hesitate to call the contrary opinion inhuman, cruel, barbarous*, in a word, an executioner's opinion, that is pleased with damning mankind, and the most tyrannical that ever was. He will not allow a truly charitable Christian can have any other sentiment than that which places the elect in all communions where Jesus Christ is known; and informs us that, "if amongst his own people this doctrine has not been hitherto much insisted on, it was from the effect of a policy which he does not approve." Nay, he has found means to render his system so far plausible in his party, that they no longer oppose anything else to our instructions, and believe they have therein so strong a hold as not to be forced from it; so that the last resource of the Protestant party is to give to Jesus Christ a kingdom like unto that of Satan; a kingdom "divided against itself†, ready," by consequence, "to be brought to desolation, and whose houses are falling one upon the other."

52.—*The history of this opinion, beginning from the Socinians.—Division in the Reformation between Mr. Claude and Mr. Pajon.*

If now one should desire to know the history and progress of this opinion, the glory of the invention belongs to the Socinians. These men, indeed, agree not with the rest of Christians in fundamental articles, for they admit but two; the unity of God and the mission of Jesus Christ. But, they say, all those who profess them with manners suitable to this profession, are true members of the Church universal, and that the dogmata superadded to this foundation hinder not salvation; nor is the world ignorant of the notions and indifferency of *De-Dominis* on this head. After the Synod of Charenton, where the Calvinists received the Lutherans to communion, notwithstanding the separation of both societies, there resulted a necessity of acknowledging one and the same Church in different communions. The Lutherans were far from this sentiment; but Calixtus*, one of the most renowned and learned of them, has, in our days, brought it into vogue in Germany, and admits into the communion of the universal Church all sects preserving the foundation, without even excepting the Church of Rome. It is nearly thirty years since Huisseau, minister of Saumur, pushed on the consequence of this doctrine to a great extent. This minister, already famous in his party for his publication of Ecclesiastical Discipline compared with the decrees of national Synods, made himself much spoken of by the plan of reuniting all Christians of all sects, which he proposed in 1670; and Mr. Jurieu acquaints us†, that he had many sticklers, notwithstanding the solemn condemnation which was passed on his books and person. A little while since, Mr. Pajon, the famous minister of Orleans, in his answer to the Pastoral Letter of the French clergy, did not think himself able to maintain the Church system defended by Mr. Claude. The catholicity or universality of the Church appeared to him much more extensive than his brother had made it; and Mr. Jurieu gives notice to Mr. Nicole‡, "that answering Mr. Claude's book will be doing nothing, unless he also answer that of Mr. Pajon, by reason that these two gentlemen having taken different paths, one and the same answer cannot satisfy both."

---

* System. Præf. towards the end.

† Luke xi. 17, 18.

53.—*Sentiments of the Minister Jurieu.*

In this division of the Reformation, driven to the utmost straits on the question regarding the Church, Mr. Jurieu § sided with Mr. Pajon; and not affrighted with the separation of Churches, decides, "that all Christian societies which agree in some tenets, inasmuch as they agree, are united to the body of the Christian Church, though they be in schism one against another, *even to daggers drawing*."

Notwithstanding these so general expressions, he varies in regard of the Socinians; for at first in his "allowable Prepossessions," where he spoke naturally what he thought, he begins, by enrolling them "amongst the members of the Christian Church *." He seems a little puzzled at the question, whether or no one may save his soul amongst them: for on one hand, he seems to allow none capable of salvation but those who live in sects wherein the divinity of Jesus Christ, with the other fundamental articles, are acknowledged; and on the other †, after compounding "the body of the Church of all that great heap of sects which make profession of Christianity in all provinces of the world put together," wherein the Socinians are visibly comprehended, he concludes in express terms, "that the saints and elect are spread in all parts of this vast body."

---

* Calixt. de fid. et stud. Conc. Ecc. n. 1, 2, 3, 4, &c. Ludg. Bat. 1651

† Avert. aux. Prot. de l'Eur. at the beginning of the Preju. p. 19.

‡ Ibid. p. 12. § Prejug. p. 4.

The Socinians gained their cause, and Mr. Jurieu was blamed, even in his own party, for having been too favourable to them; which is the reason that he restrains in some measure his ideas in his systems: for whereas, in his "Prepossessions," he placed naturally in the body of the universal Church all sects whatsoever without exception: in the system, he commonly adds to it this corrective, "at least those who preserve the fundamental articles ‡;" which he explains in behalf of the Trinity, and other points of like consequence. Thereby he seemed to limit his general propositions: but at last, led on by the force of his principle, he broke through all restraints laid on him by the policy of the party, and loudly owned that the true faithful may be found in the communion of a Socinian Church.

This is the history of that opinion which makes up the Catholic Church out of separate communions. In all probability, its authority among Protestants would be great, did not policy obstruct it. The disciples of Calixtus multiply in the Lutheran party. As for the Calvinists, it is plain the new system of the Church prevails among them; and as Mr. Jurieu signalizes himself in that party, by defending it, and none has better laid down the principles, nor better foreseen the consequences of it, its irregularity cannot be shewn better, than by relating the disorder into which that minister has cast himself by this doctrine, and the advantage he at the same time affords the Catholics.

54.—*Salvation may be had in the Church of Rome, according to this Minister.*

To dive to the bottom of his notion, his distinction of the Church considered as to its body, and of the Church considered as to its soul, must be presupposed [*]. The profession of Christianity is sufficient to make part of the body of the Church, which he advances against Mr. Claude, who compounds the body of the Church, of the true faithful only; but to have part in the soul of the Church, it is necessary to be in the grace of God.

---

* Prej. leg. p. 4. † Ibid. p. 4, &c. p. 8. ‡ Ibid. p. 133, &c.

This distinction supposed, the question is, what sects are simply in the body of the Church; and what are those in which one may attain to partake of her soul, namely, of charity and the grace of God? which he explains sufficiently by an abridgment he makes of Church history. This he begins, by saying [†] "that she was corrupted after the third century:" this date must be observed. He passes over the fourth century without either approving or blaming it: "but, (continues he [‡],) in the fifth, the sixth, the seventh, and the eighth, the Church adopted divinities of a second rate, adored relics, made herself images, and prostrated herself before them even in the Churches; and then grown sickly, deformed, ulcerous, she was alive nevertheless:" so that her soul was in her still, and what is worthy of observation, it was in her in the midst of idolatry.

He goes on saying [§], "that the universal Church divides itself into two great parties, the Greek Church, and the Latin Church. The Greek Church, before this great schism, was already subdivided into Nestorians, Eutycheans, Melchites, and divers other sects: the Latin Church into *Papists*, Vaudois, Hussites, Taborites, Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anabaptists; and he pronounces, that it is an error to imagine all these different parties had absolutely broken off from Jesus Christ, by breaking one from the other."

55.—*The Church of Rome comprehended amongst the living Societies, wherein the fundamentals of Salvation are retained.*

Who breaks not with Jesus Christ, breaks not from salvation and life; accordingly, he counts these societies among the living societies. The societies that are dead, according to this minister, are "those which ruin the foundation; to wit, the Trinity, the Incarnation, the satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and other the like articles; but this is not the case of the Greeks, the Armenians, the Cophts, the Abyssins, the Russians, the *Papists*, and Protestants; all these societies

---

[*] Prej. leg. ch. i. Syst. l. i. ch. i.

[†] Ibid. p. 5.

[‡] Ibid.

[§] Ibid. p. 6.

(says he) have composed the Church, and therein does God preserve his fundamental truths*."

It signifies nothing, to object that they subvert these truths by consequences drawn in good form from their principles; because, as they disown these consequences, they ought not, says this minister†, to be imputed to them; for which reason, he acknowledges God's elect even amongst the Eutychians, who confounded the two natures of Jesus Christ, and amongst the Nestorians, who divided his person. "There is no room to doubt (says he‡) but God preserves a remnant in them according to the election of grace;" and lest it should be imagined there is more difficulty with respect to the Church of Rome than for others, by reason that she is, according to him, the kingdom of Antichrist, he clears this doubt in express terms, asserting "that God's elect were preserved even in the kingdom of Antichrist, and in Babylon itself§."

56.—*The Antichristianism of the Church of Rome no hindrance to Men's saving their souls in it.*

The minister proves it by these words:—"Come out of Babylon, my people||." Whence he concludes that the people of God, that is, his elect, must necessarily have been in it; but, continues he, "they were not in it, as his elect are in some manner amongst the heathens, from whom they are withdrawn; for God does not call those his people who are in a state of damnation; consequently, the elect who are found in Babylon are absolutely out of this state, and in a state of grace. It is (says he) clearer than day, that God, in these words, 'come out of Babylon, my people,' alludes to the Jews of the Babylonian captivity," who certainly, "in this state, did not cease to be Jews and the people of God."

After this manner the spiritual Jews and the true Israel of God¶, that is, his true children, are to be found in the communion of Rome, and will be found there to the end, it being evident that this sentence, "come out of Babylon, my people**," is pronounced even in the fall and desolation of that mystical Babylon, which he will have to be the Church of Rome.

57.—*Men may be saved amongst us whilst retaining our Faith and Worship.*

In order to explain how men are saved in her, the minister

---

* Syst. pp. 147, 149.

† Ibid. p. 155.

‡ Prej. ch. i. p. 16.

§ Ibid.

|| Syst. p. 145.

¶ Gal. vi. 16.

** Rev. xviii. 4.

distinguishes two ways: the first, which he has taken from Mr. Claude, is the way of separation and discernment, when one is in the communion of a Church without partaking of her errors, and of whatever may be evil in her practices: the second, added by him to that of Mr. Claude, is the way of toleration on God's side, when, in consideration of fundamental truths retained in a communion, God pardons errors superadded to them.

That he comprehends us in this last way, he clearly gives to understand in his system, where he declares the conditions upon which one may hope from God some toleration "in the sects which sap the foundation by their additions, yet without taking it away*." By what has been now said, it is plain he means us and those like to us; and the condition under which he allows men may be saved in such a kind of sect is, "that they communicate with it in sincerity, believing that it has preserved the essence of the sacraments, and obliges to nothing against conscience," which shews (so far from obliging those who abide in these sects to reject their doctrine in order to be saved) that they who remain therein with the greatest sincerity, and are the most persuaded as well of the doctrine as of the practices in use amongst them, may be the soonest saved.

58.—*One may be saved who is sincere in his conversion from Calvinism to the Church of Rome.*

It is true he seems to add two other conditions also; one, of having been engaged in these sects from one's birth; and the other, of not having it in one's power to communicate with a more pure society, either because one knows none such, or "is not in a condition of breaking" with the society he happens to be in†. But afterwards he passes beyond these bounds: for after having proposed the question, whether it be lawful "to be one while a Greek, another while a Latin; now a reformed, then a *Papist;* sometimes a Calvinist, somes a Lutheran," he answers‡, "no, when you make profession of believing what you do not believe in fact. But if you pass from one sect to another by way of seduction, and because you cease to be persuaded of certain opinions which you had formerly looked upon as true," he declares that "one may proceed to different communions without hazard of salvation, as well as remain in them: because those who pass into sects, which neither ruin nor subvert the foundations, are not in a different state from those who are born in them;" so that one may not only remain a Latin and Papist when born in this communion, but also come into it from Calvinism, without forsaking the way of salvation; nor are they who save their souls amongst us, such only, as said Mr. Claude, who abide amongst us without approving our doctrine, but such even as are sincere in the profession of it.

---

* Syst. pp. 173, 174.

† Ibid. pp. 158, 164, 259.

‡ Ibid. pp. 174, 175, 195.

59.—*This Doctrine of the Minister destroys all he says against us and our Idolatries.*

Our brethren, the pretended Reformed, may thence be convinced, that all they are told of our idolatries is wretchedly extravagant. Never was it believed that an idolater might be saved under pretence of his sincerity: so gross an error, so manifest an impiety, is incompatible with an upright conscience. Wherefore the idolatry imputed to us is of a particular species; it is an idolatry invented to excite against us the hatred of the weak and ignorant. But it is high time they should undeceive themselves; for, to be converted is no such great misfortune, since he who cries out the loudest against our idolatries, and loads with most reproaches the converters and converted, is agreed that all of them may be true Christians.

60.—*The Ethiopians saved adding Circumcision to the Sacraments of the Church.*

Neither is the presumption imputed to us of having, on one side, augmented the number of the Sacraments, and on the other, mutilated the Supper by cutting off, as they say, a part from it, any longer to be exaggerated by them: for this minister declares it would be "a cruelty to turn out of the Church *" such as admit other sacraments than those two, which he pretends are only instituted by Jesus Christ, namely, Baptism and the Supper; and so far from excluding us thence for having added to them Confirmation, Extreme Unction, and the rest, he does not even exclude from it the Ethiopic Christians, who, says he, "receive circumcision, not by a politic custom, but in quality of a sacrament, although St. Paul has declared, 'If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing †.'"

---

* Syst. pp. 539, 548.

† Gal. v. 2.

61.—*Communion under one kind contains, according to the Ministers, the whole substance of the Eucharistic Sacrament.*

As for what concerns communion under one kind, nothing is more common in the writings of the ministers, even of this author himself, than to say, that by so giving the Eucharistic sacrament we corrupt the foundation and essence thereof; which, in matter of sacraments, is saying "the same thing as if we no longer had them*." But such propositions are not to be taken literally as they stand; since Mr. Claude has already told us that, before the Reformation, "our Fathers receiving but in one kind, had nevertheless all necessary food without subtraction of any part thereof†;" and Mr. Jurieu says still more clearly the same thing, forasmuch as, after having defined the Church "the aggregate of all the communions which preach the same Jesus Christ, which declare the same salvation, which give the same sacraments in substance, and which teach the same doctrine‡," he counts us expressly in this collection of communions, and in the Church; which necessarily supposes that we give the substance of the Eucharist, and by consequence, that both kinds are not essential to it. Let our brethren, therefore, no longer defer coming over to us in sincerity and truth, since their ministers have removed for them the greatest obstacle, if not the only one, which they allege against it.

62.—*The excesses of the Confession of Faith softened in our favour.*

The truth is, there appears a manifest opposition betwixt this system and the Confessions of Faith of the Protestant Churches; for the confessions of faith, all of them, unanimously give two only marks of a true Church, "The pure preaching of God's word, and the administration of the Sacraments conformably to the institution of Jesus Christ §;" for which reason, the confession of faith of our pretended Reformed has concluded ||, "That in the Roman Church, whence the pure truth of God was banished, and where the sacraments were corrupted, or wholly annihilated, properly speaking, there was no Church at all." But our minister assures us ¶, these expressions are not to be understood in their strict sense; as much as to say, there is a great deal of exaggeration and excess in what the Reformation lays to our charge.

---

* Syst. p. 548. † S. n. 37, 41. ‡ Ibid. p. 216.
§ Prej. legit. p. 24. || Art. xxviii. S. n. 26. ¶ Ibid.

63.—*The two marks of a true Church given by Protestants are sufficiently to be seen amongst us.*

However, it is something curious to behold how the minister will acquit himself as to these two marks of the true Church so solemn in the whole Protestant party. It is true, says he *, " We lay them down : we, that is to say, we Protestants : but for my part, I would give the thing (proceeds he) another turn, and would say, that to know the body of the Christian and univeral Church in general, there is but one mark requisite, viz. the confession of the name of Jesus Christ, the true Messias and Redeemer of mankind."

This is not all: for after having found the marks of the body of the universal Church, " It is necessary to find those of the soul, to the end you may know in what part of this Church God preserves his elect." Here it is, answers the minister †, " that we must return to our two marks, pure preaching, and pure administration of the sacraments." But beware you be not deceived ; " this is not to be taken in a strict sense ‡." To save the essence of a Church, the preaching is sufficiently pure when the fundamental truths are preserved, what error soever be superadded ; the sacraments are sufficiently pure, notwithstanding the additions : let us add, following the aforesaid principle, notwithstanding the subtractions which spoil them : forasmuch as, in the midst of all this, the foundation subsists, and "God applies to his elect what good there is, hindering whatsoever of human institution from turning to their prejudice and destruction." We conclude, therefore, with this minister, that nothing of what has been said on this subject in the Confession of Faith must be taken in a strict sense ; and moreover, that the Church of Rome, (Lutherans and Calvinists, calm your hatred !) the Church of Rome, I say, so much hated and so much condemned, in spite of all your confessions of faith and all your reproaches, may glory in having, in a very true sense, as far as is necessary to form the children of God, "the pure preaching of the Word, and the right administration of the Sacraments."

64.— *The Confession of Faith hath no longer any authority amongst the Ministers.*

If it be said, these favourable interpretations of the Confessions of Faith are quite opposite to, and destroy the text; that for instance, what is there said of the Church of Rome, that truth is "banished from her, the sacraments either falsified or wholly annihilated, and, properly speaking, that we have no such thing as a Church amongst us*;" are far different things from what we have just heard from our ministers. I own as much; but the reason in short is, they have found by experience that there is no longer any possibility of maintaining their confessions of faith, to wit, the foundations of the Reformation. Nor indeed is it less truth that, in the main, little are the ministers concerned about them; and it is only from a point of honour that they give themselves any pains to answer in their behalf; which was the cause of the minister Jurieu's inventing the aforesaid answers, more polite and better suited to his turn, than sincere and solid.

---

* Prej. legit. p. 25. Syst. p. 214. † Ibid. p. 25. ‡ Ibid.

65.—*This system changes the language of Christians, and confounds their ideas, even of those of the Reformation.*

Now, to maintain this new system, a courage is requisite capable of withstanding any difficulty, and not to be startled at any novelty. Although men be animated against one another even to "daggers drawing," it must be said, they are but one body in Jesus Christ†. If any one rebel against the Church, and scandalize her, either by his crimes or his errors, one would think, by excommunicating him, he is cut off from the body of the Church in general, and thus have Protestants spoken as well as we: it is a mistake; this scandalous and this heretical person is cut off but from one particular flock, and do what you will, remains a member of the Catholic Church by the sole profession of the Christian name: notwithstanding that Jesus Christ has pronounced, "If any one neglect to hear the Church, look upon him‡," not as a man that is cut off from a particular flock, and who remains in the great one of the Church in general, but look upon him as "an heathen and a publican," as an alien from Christianity, as a man that has no longer any part with God's people.

66.—*Manifest contrariety between the notions of the Minister in regard of Excommunication, and those of his own Church.*

Further, what Mr. Jurieu here advances is a particular opinion wherein he evidently contradicts his own Church. A national Synod has defined excommunication in these terms: "to excommunicate (say they) is to cut a man off from the body of the Church like a rotten member, and to deprive him of her communion and all her benefits[*]." And in the proper form of excommunication, the people are thus addressed: "We remove this rotten member from the society of the faithful, that he may be to you as an heathen and a publican." Mr. Jurieu[†] spares no pains to embroil this matter with his distinctions of sentence declaratory and sentence juridical; sentence which cuts off from the body of the Church, and sentence which cuts off only from a particular confederation. He invents these distinctions only that the reader may lose himself in the maze of these subtleties, and not perceive he is fed with empty sound. For, after all, he never will be able to shew, in the pretended Reformed Churches, any other excommunication, separation, lopping off, than the above-mentioned; nor can one depart more expressly from it, than does Mr. Jurieu. He pronounces, and repeats in a hundred places and a hundred different ways, that "it is impossible to banish a man from the universal Church[‡];" and his Church says on the contrary, that the excommunicated person must be looked upon as a heathen, who no longer appertains to God's people. Mr. Jurieu proceeds[§]: "All excommunication whatsoever is made by a particular Church, and is nothing else but an expulsion from a particular Church;" and we see, according to the rules of his religion, that a particular Church severs a man from the body of the Church as "one does a rotten member," which doubtless no longer cleaves to any part of the body after it is once divided from it.

---

* Art. xxviii. † Ibid. S. n. 15. ‡ Matt. xviii. 17.

67.—*Confessions of Faith but arbitrary conventions.*

Let us, nevertheless, consider again what are these particular Churches and these particular flocks, from which he supposes one is separated by excommunication. The Minister explains himself by this principle[||]: "All whatever different flocks have no other external link than that which is made by way of voluntary and arbitrary confederation, such as was that of the Christian Churches in the third age, on account that they found themselves united under the same temporal prince." So that, ever since the third age, when the Church was still found in her purity, the Churches, according to the Minister, were no otherwise united than by an arbitrary confederacy, or, as he elsewhere styles it, "by accident[¶]."

---

[*] 2 Syn. of Par. 1565. Disci. ch. 5. Art. 17. p. 102.

[†] Syst. l. ii. ch. iii.

[‡] Syst. p. 24, &c.

[§] Ibid.

[||] Prej. p. 6. Syst. pp. 246, &c. 254, 262, 269, 305, 557.

[¶] Ibid. p. 265.

What! Those Christians then who were not subject to the Roman Empire, those who were spread from the time of St. Irenæus, and even from the time of St. Justin, amidst the Barbarians and Scythians, were they under no external band with the other Churches, and had they not a right to communicate with them? This is not the notion they have formerly given us of Christian fraternity. All that are orthodox have a right to communicate with an orthodox Church; all that are Catholic, to wit all members of the Church universal, with the whole Church. All those who bear the mark of the children of God have a right to be admitted wherever they find the table of their common Father, provided their manners be approved: but here comes one to disturb this fine order; you are no longer in society, "but by accident;" Christian fraternity is changed into arbitrary confederacies, which you may extend at will, more or less, according to the different confessions of faith agreed upon *. These confessions of faith are treaties in which you insert whatever you please. Some have put in them, "that they are to teach the verities of grace as expounded by St. Austin †," and these, we are told, are the pretended Reformed churches: far from truth; nobody is less, in their doctrine, than St. Austin; yet they are pleased to say so. These men are not allowed to be "Semipelagians, and the Swiss, no less than those of Geneva, would exclude them from their communions ‡." As for those who have not made the like convention, they shall be Semipelagians, if they please. What is still more, those who have entered into the confederacy of Geneva and that of the pretended Reformed, where one thinks he is obliged to maintain the grace of St. Austin, "may depart from the agreement §;" but then they must be contented to be separated from a confederation whose laws they have violated, and "what one would tolerate everywhere else," can be no longer tolerated in those flocks in which other conventions had been made.

68.—*Independentism established contrary to the Decree of Charenton.*

But what will become of those men who break the agreement of the Calvinian Reformation, or of some such other like confederacy? Shall they be then obliged to enter into league with some other Church? No such thing: "It is nowise necessary, when you separate yourself from one Church, to find out another to adhere to*." I am aware he is forced to say so, because otherwise he could not excuse the Protestant Churches, which, on their separation from the Church of Rome, were not able to find on earth a Church they could embrace. But we must hear the reason which authorizes such a separation. "It is (continues Mr. Jurieu †) because all churches are naturally free and independent of one another;" or, as he explains it in another place, "naturally and originally, all Churches are independent."

---

* Syst. p. 254. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid. p. 249. § Ibid. p. 254.

Here is exactly our doctrine, will say the Independents; we are the true Christians that defend this primitive and natural liberty of Churches. Yet Charenton has nevertheless condemned them in 1644. Therefore by anticipation has also condemned Mr. Jurieu, who maintains them ‡; but let us hear the Decree. "Whereas it has been represented, that many who call themselves Independents, because they teach that every church ought to govern herself by her own laws *without any dependence* on any body in Church-matters, and free from any obligation of acknowledging the authority of Conferences and Synods for the conduct and government;" that is, without any confederation with any other Church whatsoever; and this is exactly the case of Mr. Jurieu. But the Synod's answer is very different from his; for the Synod pronounces, "that it ought to be dreaded, lest this poison insensibly diffusing itself, should create (say they) disorder and confusion amongst us, should open a gate to all kind of irregularities and extravagances, and make void all means of applying a remedy; which would be equally prejudicial to Church and State, and give room to form as many religions as there are parishes and particular assemblies." And Mr. Jurieu concludes, on the contrary, that by separating from one Church without adhering to another, you do nothing but retain "the liberty and independence, which naturally and originally belongs to Churches," namely, that liberty which Jesus Christ, at their formation, bestowed upon them.

69.—*All authority and subordination of Churches depends on Princes.*

Accordingly, there is no way of maintaining, conformably to the principles of this minister, these Conferences and Synods.

---

* Lib. iii. ch. xv. p. 547.

† Ibid.

‡ Disc. ch. vi. of the union of Churches. Notes on the 2d Art. p. 118.

For he supposes, in case a Catholic kingdom should divide itself from Rome, and then subdivide itself into many sovereignties, that each Prince might make a Patriarch, and establish, in his state, a government absolutely independent of that of its neighbouring states "without appeal," without union, without correspondence *; for all that, in his notion, depends on the Prince; and it is for this reason that he makes the first confederation of Churches depend on the unity of the Roman Empire. But, if this be so, his uncle, Lewis du Moulin, gains his cause: for he pretends †, that all this subordination of Conferences and Synods (if you consider it as ecclesiastical and spiritual) is nothing else but Popery in disguise, and the ushering in of Antichrist; consequently, that there is no power in this distribution of Churches but from the Sovereign's authority; and that excommunications and degradations made by Synods, whether provincial or national, have no authority but from thence. But by a little further extension of this argument, the excommunications of consistories will appear no more effectual than those of Synods: so that, either there will be no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the Independents are in the right; or, it will be lodged in the Prince's hand; and, in fine, Lewis du Moulin must have converted his nephew, who so long opposed his errors.

70.—*The true Christian Unity.*

See what this system comes to, wherein the whole solution of this difficulty about the Church is placed; it is matter of astonishment to hear these novelties. What an error to imagine there is no external Union between Christian Churches, but dependently on Princes, or by some other "arbitrary and voluntary confederation;" and not be sensible that Jesus Christ hath obliged his faithful to live in a Church, to wit, as is owned, in an exterior society, and to communicate with one another, not only in the same faith and the same sentiments, but also, when they meet, in the same sacraments and the same service; insomuch that, however distant Churches be, yet are they but the same Church distributed into divers places, the diversity of places not hindering the unity of the holy table, at which all communicate one with another, as they do with Jesus Christ their common head.

---

* Syst. p. 546.

† Fasci. Ep. Lud. Moli.

71.—*Rashness of the Minister, who owns that his System is contrary to the Faith of all ages.*

Let us now consider the origin of this new system which we have just now taken a view of. Its author boasts *, perhaps, as he does in other tenets, of having on his side the three first ages; and, it is likely, the opinion which concludes the whole Church in one and the same communion (it being pretended so tyrannical) will be born under the empire of Antichrist: no; it was born in Asia, even in the third age: Firmilian, so great a man, and his colleagues, so great bishops, are the authors of it: it passed over into Africa, where St. Cyprian, so illustrious a martyr, and the light of the Church, embraced it with the whole council of Africa; and it was this cruel opinion which made them rebaptize all heretics, no other reason for it being alleged by them, but that heretics were not of the Catholic Church.

It must be owned St. Cyprian made use of this bad argument: Heretics and Schismatics are not of the body of the Catholic Church; therefore they ought to be rebaptized at their coming to it. But Mr. Jurieu would not have the assurance to say, that the principle of the Church's unity, abused by St. Cyprian, was as new as the consequence he drew from it, since this minister acknowledges †, "that the false idea of the Church's unity was formed on the history of the two first ages down to the midst, or end of the third. We must not wonder (continues he) that the Church accounted all the sects which existed during those times, as entirely separated from the body of the Church, for that was true;" and he adds, "it was at that time, namely, in the two first ages down to the middle of the third ‡, that they got a habit of believing that heretics did not in any manner appertain to the Church:" so that the doctrine of St. Cyprian, which he accuses of novelty, nay, of tyranny, was a habit contracted ever since the first two ages of the Church; that is, from the first beginning of Christianity.

It must no less be owned that this doctrine of St. Cyprian, concerning the unity of the Church, was not invented on the occasion of rebaptizing heretics, by reason that the book, "Concerning the Unity of the Church," wherein the doctrine excluding heretics and schismatics is so clearly laid down, did precede the dispute of rebaptization; so that St. Cyprian entered naturally into this doctrine consequently to the tradition of the two foregoing ages.

---

* Syst. l. i. ch. vii. viii. † Ibid. p. 55. ‡ Ibid. p. 56.

Nor is it less certain that the whole Church had embraced this doctrine equally with him, long before the dispute of rebaptizing. For this dispute began under St. Stephen, Pope. Now, before this, and not only in the time of St. Lucius, his predecessor, but also from the beginning of the pontificate of St. Cornelius, predecessor to St. Lucius, Novatian and his followers* had been looked upon as separated from the communion of all the Bishops and Churches of the world, although they had not renounced the profession of Christianity, nor overthrown any fundamental article. From that time, therefore, even those that preserved the fundamentals, if under other pretexts they broke unity, were accounted separated from the universal Church.

Thus is it an unquestionable fact, that the doctrine impugned by Mr. Jurieu was received by the whole Church, not only before the quarrel about rebaptization, but even from the first origin of Christianity; and was made use of by St. Cyprian, not as a new foundation which he gave to his error, but as a common principle agreed to all the world over.

72.—*The Minister contradicts himself by asserting the Council of Nice to be of his sentiments.*

The Minister had the presumption to say †, that his ideas of the Church are the same with those of the Nicene Council, and concludes, "that this holy council did not reject all heretics from the communion of the Church, because it did not command all of them to be rebaptized, neither requiring this in regard of the Novatians or Cathari, nor of the Donatists, nor of the rest that retained the foundation of faith, but only of the Paulianists, namely the followers of Paul of Samosata, who denied the Trinity and Incarnation." But, waiving other arguments, the Minister needs but hear himself, in order to be convicted. He speaks of the Council of Nice "as of the most universal ever held ‡;" but which, nevertheless, was not altogether so, since "the great assemblies of the Novatians and Donatists were not called to it." I desire no more than this confession to conclude, that consequently they were not accounted, at that time, as part of the universal Church, since there was not so much as the least thought of calling them to the Council expressly convened to represent her.

And, in fact, let us hear how this Council speaks of the

---

* Epist. Cyp. ad Antonian., &c. † Syst. p. 61. ‡ Ibid. p. 234.

Novatians or Cathari: those, says the council*, "when they shall come to the Catholic Church." Enough said; the dispute is ended: in the Church, therefore, they could not be. Nor does it speak in other terms of the Paulianists whose baptism it condemns†: as for the Paulianists, when they ask to be received into the Catholic Church, see again; in it, therefore, they were not, according to the notions of these Fathers, and the minister agrees therein. But that he may no longer presume to say, that those whose baptism is received are in the Catholic Church, and not those whose baptism is rejected; the council puts out of the Church no less those whose baptism it approves, as the Novatians, than those whom it makes be rebaptized, as the Paulianists; consequently, this difference did not at all depend on those being reputed members of the Catholic Church, and not these.

As much must be said of the Donatists, the council of Nice neither admitting of their communion nor their bishops; on the contrary, receiving to its sessions Cecilian, bishop of Carthage, from whom the Donatists had separated. The council, therefore, looked upon the Donatists as separated from the universal Church.

Let the minister now come and tell us that the Fathers of the Nicene council are of his opinion, or that their doctrine was new, or that when they pronounced against the Arians this sentence—"The holy Catholic and Apostolic Church anathemizes them,"—they left them fellow-members of this same Catholic Church, and did but banish them from a voluntary and arbitrary confederation, which they might extend, more or less, according to their fancy: such discourses ought to appear nothing less than prodigies.

73.—*The Minister is condemned by the Creeds which he receives.*

The Minister counts amongst the symbols received by the whole world, that of the Apostles, that of Nice, and that of Constantinople. We are agreed, indeed, that these three creeds make but one, and that the Apostles' creed is but explained by that of the two first Œcumenical councils‡. We have seen the sentiments of the council of Nice. The council of Constantinople proceeds on the same principles, in that it banishes all sects from its unity: whence it concludes, in its letter to all the bishops, that the body of the Church is not divided; and it was conformably to this same spirit that it said in its creed—"I believe *one* Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church,"—adding this word *one*, to those, *Holy* and *Catholic*, which were in the Symbol of the Apostles, and strengthening it by that of *Apostolic*, in order to shew that the Church thus defined and perfectly one by the exclusion of all sects, was that which was founded by the Apostles.

---

* Conc. Nic. Can. viii. † Ibid. Can. xix. ‡ Conc. c. p. Epist. ad Omn. Episc.

74.—*The Minister endeavours to weaken the authority of the Apostles' Creed.*

The judicious reader expects here to know what this hardy minister will say in regard of the Apostles' Creed, and touching that article, "I believe the Catholic Church." Until now it had been believed, and even in the Reformation, that this creed, so unanimously received by all Christians, was an abridgment, and as a summary of the doctrine of the Apostles and the Scripture. But the minister tells us quite the contrary*; for, after deciding that the Apostles were not the authors of it, he will not even grant, what none else denied till now, that, at least, it was made wholly according to their spirit. He says, therefore, "that we must look for the sense of the articles of the creed, not in the Scripture, but in the intention of those who composed it." But, proceeds he, "the creed was not made all at once: the article—'I believe the Catholic Church'—was added in the fourth age." What does this reasoning tend to else, but to prepare himself a refuge against the creed, and give it only the authority of the fourth age? Whereas all Christians to this time have held it for a common Confession of Faith, of all ages, and of all Christian Churches, from the days of the Apostles.

75.—*A new gloss of the Minister on the Apostles' Creed.*

But let us see, nevertheless, in what manner he will define the Catholic Church conformably to the creed. He at once rejects the definition which he imputes to Catholics†; nor does he approve more of that which he attributes to Protestants. For his part, who no less raises himself above his brethren, the Protestants, than above his adversaries, the Catholics, being to define the Church of all times, he does it thus: "it is the body of those who make profession of believing Jesus Christ the true Messias; a body divided into a great number of sects;" he must add besides, which excommunicate one another, to the end that all anathematized

---

* Prej. leg. ch. ii. pp. 27, 28. Syst. p. 217.

† Prej. p. 29.

Heresies, nay, all Schismatics, though divided from their brethren, "even to daggers drawing," (to use the minister's expression,) may have the happiness of being in the Church expressed by the creed, and in the Christian unity which it teaches us. This is what men are bold enough to say in the Reformation, and the kingdom of Jesus Christ carries among them, in its proper definition, the character of the division "whereby every kingdom (as the Gospel says) is brought to desolation*."

76.—*The Minister destroys the notion of a Catholic Church taught by himself when he explained the Catechism.*

The minister should at least have called to mind the Catechism, which he himself taught at Sedan so many years; wherein, after reciting "I believe the Catholic Church," it concludes, "that out of the Church there is nothing but damnation and death, and that all those who separate themselves from the community of the faithful to make a sect apart, ought not to hope salvation†. It is very certain, that the Church here spoken of, is the universal Church; therefore, in respect to her, one may make a sect apart, one may separate himself from her unity. I ask, whether in this place to make "a sect apart," be a word that implies apostacy? Is it necessary for him that makes a sect apart, to put on a turban, and publicly renounce his baptism? Do men speak thus? Should they speak thus, in a catechism, to an innocent child, on purpose to confound all his ideas, and that he may no longer know what to stick to?

77.—*The Schism of Jeroboam and the Twelve Tribes is justified.*

Methinks I labour for the salvation of souls, by continuing the recital of this minister's errors, the most exorbitant and palpable that the defence of a bad cause has perhaps ever cast man into. What he was forced to invent in support of the new system, is still more strange, if possible, and more unheard of than the system itself. It was necessary for him to perplex all the ideas with which the Scripture furnishes us. It speaks to us of the schism of Jeroboam‡ as of a detestable action, which began by a revolt, which maintained itself by a downright idolatry in adoring calves of gold, so far even as to forsake the ark of the covenant§; in fine, to renounce the law of Moses, to cast off the priesthood of Aaron and the whole Levitical ministry, to consecrate false priests of the high places and of devils. Yet must it be said, nevertheless, that these Schismatics, these Heretics, these Apostates from the law, these Idolaters, made part of God's people[*]; that the seven thousand whom God had reserved to himself, and the remainder of the elect in Israel, adhered to the schism; that the prophets of the Lord communicated with these Schismatics and Idolaters, and broke off from Judah, which was the place that God had chosen; and a schism aggravated with such circumstances ought not, it seems, to be counted "amongst those sins which destroy grace[†]." If this be true, the whole Scripture must be nothing but delusion and the most excessive exaggeration that can be found in all human language. But then, what must be said to the texts alleged by Mr. Jurieu? Any thing, rather than to own so enormous a doctrine, and to place manifest idolaters in the communion of God's children, for this is no proper place for a deeper research into this subject.

---

* Luke xi. 17.

† Catechism of the Prot. Ref. Dim. 17.

‡ Kings iii. 12. 2 Par. ix. 13.

§ 2 Paralip. xi. 15.

78.—*The Church in the Apostles' time is accused of Schism and Heresy.*

No more does the Christian than the Jewish Church escape the hands of this minister[‡]. He attacks her in her prime and vigour, even in those happy days when she was governed by the Apostles. For, if we believe him, the converted Jews, namely, the greatest part of the Church, there being "so many thousands of them[§]," according to St. James's testimony, and undoubtedly its most noble part, since it comprehended those on whom the rest "were grafted;" the stock "and holy root whence the fatness of the good olive[||]" was derived to the wild branches, were Heretics and Schismatics[¶], nay, guilty of a heresy of which St. Paul has said, "it destroyed grace, and rendered Christ of no effect to them[**]." The rest of the Church, to wit, those who came from heathenism, partook of the schism and heresy by consenting to it, and by acknowledging those as holy and brethren in Jesus Christ, who entertained in their minds so strange a heresy, and in their hearts so criminal a jealousy; and the Apostles themselves were the most heretical and schismatical of all, for conniving at such crimes and errors. Such is the idea he gives us of the Christian Church under the Apostles, when the blood of Jesus Christ was, as I may say, still reeking, his doctrine fresh in their minds—the spirit of Christianity in its full strength. What an opinion will the impious have of the Church in her progress, if these so much extolled beginnings be grounded on heresy and schism; nay, if corruption even reach to those who had the first-fruits of the Spirit?

---

[*] Syst. l. i. ch. xiii.

[†] Ibid. ch. xx. p. 153.

[‡] Ibid. ch. xiv., xxi. p. 167.

[§] Acts xxi.

[||] Rom. xi. 17, &c.

[¶] Syst. Ibid. ch. xx. p. 167.

[**] Gal. v. 2, 4.

79.—*According to the Minister, one may save himself even in the Communion of Socinians.*

It seemed as if our minister was for excluding the Socinians, at least, from the communion of God's people, he having so frequently said, that they impugn directly the fundamental truths, and that these being subverted, such societies are dead and can raise no children to Almighty God. But all this was nothing but sham; and the minister would heartily despise whosoever should be deluded by it.

And, indeed, the principal foundation of his doctrine is *, "That the word of God is never preached in any country but God makes it effectual with regard to some people." As then, very certainly, the word of God is preached amongst the Socinians, the minister concludes aright, according to his principles †, "That if Socinianism had been as much diffused as is, for example, Popery, God would also have found means of feeding in it his elect, and of hindering their taking part in the mortal heresies of that sect, as he found means heretofore of preserving, in Arianism, a number of elect and virtuous souls untainted with the Arian heresy."

And if the Socinians, in the state they are in at present, cannot contain in their body the elect of God, it is not on account of their perverse doctrine, but ‡, "for that they being in small numbers, and dispersed up and down without making a figure in the world, and in most places having not so much as an assembly, it is not necessary to suppose that God saves any of them." Nevertheless, since it is certain the Socinians have had churches in Poland, and have at this day in Transylvania, one might ask of the minister, what is the number requisite to make a figure? But be that as it will, according to him it depends only on princes to give children of God to all societies whatsoever, by giving them assemblies; and if the devil complete his work, if taking men on that side their senses bias to, and, by that means, multiplying Socinians in the world, he also finds means of procuring them a more free and extensive exercise of their religion, he will compel Jesus Christ to form his elect amongst them.

---

* Prej. leg. pp. 4, 5, &c.

† Syst. pp. 147, 149, &c. Prej. leg. p. 16. Syst. l. i. ch. xii. pp. 98, 102; ch. xix. p. 149, &c.; ch. xx. p. 153, &c.

‡ Ibid.

80.—*By the Minister's principles, one might be saved in the exterior Communion of the Mahometans and Jews.*

The minister will answer doubtless, that if he says, you may be saved in the communion of Socinians, it is not by the way of toleration, but by that of discernment and separation; that is to say, it is not by presupposing God tolerates Socinianism as he does other sects which have preserved the foundation, but, on the contrary, by presupposing that these the Socinian associates, discerning the good from the evil in the doctrine of this sect, will reject in their hearts what is blasphemous therein, although they remain united therewith exteriorly.

But take his answer which way you will, it is equally full of impiety. For in the first place, this makes him inconsistent with himself in respect to the toleration of those who deny the divinity of the Son of God, since he extends this toleration even to the Arians: "To damn," says he*, "all those numberless Christians who lived in the external communion of Arianism, some whereof detested its tenets, others were ignorant of them, some *tolerated them in the spirit of peace*, others held their tongues through fear and authority: to damn, I say, all those people, is the opinion of an executioner, and becoming the cruelty of Popery." In this manner Mr. Jurieu extends his mercy, not to those only who remained in the communion of Arians, being ignorant of their sentiments, but to those also who knew them; and not only to those who, knowing and detesting them in their hearts, did not blame them through fear, but also to those who "tolerated them in the spirit of peace," namely, to those who judged that denying the divinity of Jesus Christ was a tolerable doctrine. What, then, hinders his tolerating, in the spirit of peace, even the Socinians, as he tolerates the rest, and extending his charity so far even as to save them?

But although the minister should repent himself of having carried his toleration to this excess, and would save but those only in the Socinian communion that should heartily detest their sentiments, his doctrine would be never the better for that; since, in short, he must always save those who, conscious of the Socinian tenets, should, nevertheless, remain in their external communion, that is, frequent their assemblies, join in their prayers and worship, be present at their sermons with an exterior like to that of others who pass for men of that communion. If this dissimulation be lawful, no longer do we know what is hypocrisy, nor what this sentence means, "Depart from the tents of the wicked*."

---

* Prej. p. 22.

Should now the minister reply, that those who frequent the Socinian assemblies in this manner, ought so to direct their intention as to partake only of that which is good amongst them, namely, of the unity of God and the mission of Jesus Christ; this is a still greater absurdity, since, in this sense, there would be likewise no difficulty of living in the communion of Jews and Turks: for you need but persuade yourself, you partake only with them in the belief of God's unity, detesting in your heart, without uttering a word, all they speak impiously against Jesus Christ; and should it be said, that it is enough to incur damnation to make your usual worship in an assembly where Jesus Christ is blasphemed, the Socinians, blasphemers of his divinity and so many others his sacred truths, are no better than they.

81.—*The succession which the Minister gives his Religion, is common to him with all Heresies.*

Such are the absurdities of this new system: it was not the product of free choice, for no man takes pleasure in making himself ridiculous by advancing such paradoxes. But one false step draws on another; nor would he have plunged into this excess, but for others he had fallen into before. The Reformation had fallen into the excess of separating herself not only from the Church in which she had received her baptism, but also from all other Christian Churches. In this state, urged to answer where the Church was before the time of these Reformers, she could not keep to one constant language, and iniquity gave herself the lie. At last, quite nonplussed, and little satisfied with all the answers hitherto made in our days, she thought to extricate herself by saying †, it is not of particular societies, of Lutherans, of Calvinists, you should ask for the visible succession of their doctrine and pastors; it being true, "they were not as yet formed two hundred years ago;" granting this, yet the universal Church, whereof these sects make a part, was visible in the communions of which Christianity was composed, viz. that of the Grecians, of the Abyssinians, of the Armenians, and Latins, which is all the succession there is occasion for. Here is the last refuge; this their whole solution. But all kinds of sects, they must allow, may say the same. There is not any, nor ever was, to take in each of them no more than the common profession of Christianity, which does not find its particular succession as our minister has found his; so that, to give a descent and an always visible perpetuity to his Church, he was forced to lavish the same favour on the most novel and impious societies.

---

* Num. xvi. 26.

† Syst. l. i. ch. xxix. p. 226.; l. iii. ch. xvii.

82.—*The Minister at the same time speaks* pro *and* con *with relation to the perpetual Visibility of the Church.*

The greatest affront that can be done to truth is, to confess it, and, at the same time, to abandon or undermine it. Mr. Jurieu has owned great truths: in the first place, "that the Church is taken in Scripture for a society always visible; nay, I go (says he) further on this head than Mr. Meaux *." With all my heart; what I had said was sufficient: but since he will allow us more, I receive it from him.

Secondly, he agrees that it cannot be denied "that the Church, which the Creed obliges us to believe, is a true Church †."

This was enough to demonstrate the perpetual visibility of the Church, because that, which is believed in the Creed, is eternally and unalterably true. But in order that there may be no doubt that this article of our faith is grounded on the express promises of Jesus Christ, the minister grants us moreover, that the Church, to which Jesus Christ had promised that hell should not prevail against her, was ‡ "a confessing Church, a Church which published the faith with St. Peter, a Church, by consequence, always exterior and visible;" which he carries on so far as to declare, without more ado §, "that he, who should have the faith without the profession of the faith, would not be of the Church."

It is this also that makes him say ||, "it is essential to the Christian Church to have a ministry." Equally with Mr. Claude, he approves ¶ of our inferring from these words of our Saviour, "teach, baptize, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world **; "that there will be teachers with whom Jesus Christ shall teach, and that true preaching never shall cease in the Church." He says as much of the sacraments, and is agreed *, "that the band of Christians, by means of the sacraments, is essential to the Church; that there is no true Church without the sacraments;" whence he concludes, that it is necessary to have the essence and foundation, to be ministers of the body of the Church.

---

* Syst. p. 215. † Ibid. p. 217. ‡ Ibid. p. 215. § Ibid. p. 2.
|| L. iii. ch. xv. p. 549, &c. ¶ Ibid. pp. 228, 229. ** Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

From all these express passages, the minister concludes with us, that the Church is always visible, necessarily visible, and, what is more remarkable, visible not only as to its body, but also as to its soul, as he terms it, because, says he †, "when I see Christian societies, wherein doctrine conformable to the word of God is preserved as much as is necessary for the essence of a Church, I know and see for certain, that there are elect in it, since, wherever are the fundamental truths, they are salutary to some people."

After this chain of doctrine, which the minister confirms by so many express passages, one might think nothing could be better settled in his mind, from Scripture, from the promises of Jesus Christ, from the Creed of the Apostles, than the perpetual visibility of the Church; and yet he says the contrary, not by consequence, but in formal terms; for he says, at the same time ‡, "that this perpetual visibility of the Church is not to be found by those proofs which are called of right," that is, by Scripture, as he explains it, "otherwise than by supposing that God always preserves to himself a hidden number of the faithful, a Church, as one may say, subterraneous and unknown to the whole earth, which would be as well the body of Jesus Christ, his spouse and his kingdom, as a known Church; and in fine, that the promises of Jesus Christ would remain inviolate, though the Church should have fallen into so great an obscurity, as that it were impossible to point out and say, there is the true Church, and there does God preserve the elect."

What, then, becomes of that express acknowledgment, that the Church in the Scripture is always visible; that the promises she has received from Jesus Christ, for her perpetual duration, are addressed to a visible Church, to a Church that publishes her faith, to a Church which has the keys and a ministry, to whom the ministry is essential, and which no longer is a Church, if the profession of faith be wanting to her? This we are a loss to know; the minister

---

* Syst. pp, 539, 548.

† Prej. leg. ch. ii. pp. 21, 22, &c. Syst. p. 221.

‡ Prej. leg. pp. 21, 22, &c. Syst. p. 221.

thinks he salves all by telling us, that, for his part*, he truly believes the Church always visible, and that she hath been ever so, may be proved from history. Who does not see what he aims at? Namely, in a word, that in case it happens a Protestant should be forced to own, according to his belief, that the Church had ceased to be visible, at most he would only have denied a fact, yet not overthrown the promises of Jesus Christ. But this is putting us on the wrong scent in too gross a manner. The question in hand is not whether the Church, by good luck, has always remained to this day in her visibility, but whether she has promises of continuing for ever in it; nor, whether Mr. Jurieu believes it, but whether Mr. Jurieu has written that all Christians are obliged to believe it as a truth from God, and as a fundamental article couched in the Creed. Most certainly he has written it, as we have seen; and he goes on demonstrating, that the question touching the Church involves the ministers in such a disorder, that they know not which way to turn themselves; and if they can but meet with an evasion, it is all they aim at.

83.—*Vain distinction between errors.*

But not one is left them, provided they follow but never so little the principles which they have granted; for, if the Church be visible and always visible by the confession of the truth; if Jesus Christ has promised she would be so eternally, it is clearer than day that it is not allowable to depart one moment from her doctrine, which is saying, in other words, that she is infallible. The consequence is very plain; since, departing from the doctrine of her who always teaches truth, would be too manifestly declaring enmity to truth itself; again, nothing can be more clear and distinct than this.

Let us consider, nevertheless, what method the ministers have used to ward off this stroke. Jesus Christ has promised, say they, a perpetual ministry, yet not a ministry always pure; the essence of the ministry shall subsist in the Church, because the foundations will be retained; but what shall be added to these, will corrupt it, which makes Mr. Claude to say †, that the ministry will never come to a subtraction of a fundamental truth, such as is seen, for example, in Socinianism, which rejects the divinity of Jesus Christ; but that there is not a like inconvenience in corrupting, by addition, wholesome truths, as the Church of Rome has done, because the fundamentals of salvation still subsist.

---

* Syst. p. 125. Prej. p. 22.

† Rep. au disc. de M. de Cond. p. 383, et seq.

Pursuant to the same principles, Mr. Jurieu is agreed *, "that Jesus Christ has promised there always shall be teachers with whom he will teach, so far that true preaching shall never cease in his Church;" but he distinguishes: there always shall be teachers with whom Jesus Christ will teach the fundamental truths, he grants it; but that there never shall be errors in this ministry, he denies it †: so, "true preaching shall never cease in the Church; we own it (answers he), if by true preaching be understood a preaching which announces the essential and fundamental verities; but we deny it, if by true preaching a doctrine be understood that contains no kind of errors."

84.—*One only word destroys these subtilties.*

To dispel all these mists, nothing more is necessary than to ask these men, where it is they have learnt to put a restriction on the promises of Jesus Christ? He that is able to prevent subtractions, why must he not be able to prevent dangerous additions? What certainty, therefore, have they, that preaching shall be more pure, the ministry more privileged with regard to subtraction, than to addition? This word, "I am with you ‡," implies an universal protection to those with whom Jesus Christ does teach. If the duration of the external and visible ministry be the work of man, it may fail equally on all sides; if on account of Jesus Christ's intervening, pursuant to his promises, we are assured that subtraction has never taken place therein, no longer do we comprehend how addition can find admittance.

85.—*Strange way of securing the promises of Jesus Christ.*

And assuredly it is impossible, agreeing, as they do, that Jesus Christ has promised his Church that the truth should always be taught in her, and that he would eternally abide with the Ministers of this same Church, in order to teach with them; it is, I say, impossible he should not have meant to say, that the truth he promised to preserve in her should be pure, and such as revealed by him; there being nothing more ridiculous than to make him promise he would always teach the truth with such as, retaining a foundation of it, were to overwhelm this foundation, nay destroy it, as is supposed, with their errors, by the inevitable consequence of their doctrine.

---

* Syst. pp. 228, 229. † Ibid. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.

And, in reality, I leave the Protestants to judge whether these magnificent promises of rendering the Church immovable in the visible profession of the truth be fulfilled in the state, which the Minister has represented to us by these words*:—"We say that the Church is perpetually visible; but the greatest part of the time, and *almost always*, she is more visible by the corruption of her manners, by the addition of many *false tenets*, by the decay of her ministry, *by her errors and her superstitions*, than by the truths she does preserve." If such be the visibility which Christ has promised to his Church, if it be thus he promises†, that the truth shall always be taught in her, there is no sect, though never so impious, which may not glory that the promise of Jesus Christ is fulfilled in her: and if Jesus Christ only promises to teach with all those that shall teach some truth, whatever error may be interwoven with it, he promises nothing more to his Church than to the Socinians, to the Deists, to Atheists themselves, since none of them are gone so far astray as not to retain some remnant of the truth.

86.—*The Minister says that the Universal Church teaches, and at the same time does not teach.*

It is now easy to understand what we have inculcated so frequently, that the article of the creed, "I believe the Catholic and Universal Church," imports necessarily the belief of her infallibility, and that there is no difference between believing the Catholic Church and believing *in* the Catholic Church, to wit, by approving and assenting to her doctrine. The Minister rises up with contempt against this reasoning of Mr. de Meaux, and opposes it by two answers‡: the first is, that the Universal Church teaches nothing; the second, that, supposing she taught the truth, it would not follow that she taught it entirely pure. But he contradicts himself in these two answers: in the first, in express terms, as I am going to shew; in the second, by the evident consequence of his principles, as will be shewn hereafter. Let us, then, observe how he speaks in his first answer. "The Universal Church (says he§) mentioned in the Creed cannot, properly speaking, either teach or preach the truth:" and I prove to him the contrary by his own words, he having said, but two pages before, that the Church to which Jesus Christ promises an eternal subsistence, by saying "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, is a confessing Church, a Church that publishes her faith*:" now this Church is, undoubtedly, the Universal Church, and the same that the Creed speaks of; therefore the Church Universal, and mentioned in the Creed, confesses and publishes the truth; nor can it any longer be denied by this Minister, without giving himself the lie, but that Church does confess, does preach the truth, unless publishing and confessing be different from preaching to the whole universe.

---

* Prej. leg. p. 21.

† Matt. xvi. 18.

‡ Syst. l. i. ch. xxvi. pp. 217, 218.

§ Ibid. p. 218.

87.—*Sequel of the Minister's contradictions on this subject, that the Church Universal teaches and judges.*

But let us dive further into this Minister's sentiments on this important subject. What he most repeats, what he most insists upon in his system is, "that the Church Universal teaches nothing, decides nothing, has never passed, nor will ever pass, nor will be able ever to pass, any judgment; and that to teach, to decide, to judge, is the property of particular Churches." But this doctrine is so false, that, to see it convicted of error, no more is requisite than to continue on the reading of those places where it is asserted; for there you will find†, that "the subsisting communions, and which make a figure, are the Greeks, the Latins, the Protestants, the Abyssinians, the Armenians, the Nestorians, the Russians. I say that the consent of all these communions in *teaching* certain verities, is a kind *of judgment*, nay, of *infallible judgment*." These communions, therefore, teach; and seeing these communions, according to him, are the Universal Church, he cannot deny that the Universal Church does teach; no more can he deny that she judges in a certain sense, since he attributes to her a kind of judgment, which can be nothing less than a sentiment declared. Here is, then, by the confession of the Minister, a declared sentiment, and, moreover, an infallible sentiment of the Church he calls universal.

---

* Syst. l. i. ch. xxvi. p. 215.

† Syst. pp. 6, 218, 233, 234, 235, 236.

88.—*By the Minister's Confession, the Church's sentiment is a certain rule of Faith in the most essential matters.*

He proceeds:—"When the consent of the Universal Church is general in all ages as well as in all communions, then I maintain that this unanimous consent makes a demonstration." This is not enough; this demonstration is grounded on the perpetual assistance which, according to him, God owes his Church: "God (says he*) *cannot permit* great Christian societies to be engaged in mortal errors, nor to persevere in them a long while." And, a little after, "is it likely that God should so far have abandoned the Universal Church, that all communions, in all ages, should have unanimously renounced the most important truths?"

Thence it clearly follows that the sentiment of the Universal Church is a certain rule of faith, and the Minister makes the application of it to two the most important disputes, which, in his own judgment, possibly can arise among Christians. The first is that of the Socinians, which comprehends so many essential points; and, thereupon, "the presumption of the Socinians (says he†) cannot be considered otherwise than as a prodigious temerity and a certain token of reprobation; for that, in the articles of Jesus Christ's divinity, the trinity of persons, the redemption, satisfaction, original sin, the creation, grace, immortality of the soul, and eternity of torments, they have departed from the sentiment of the whole Universal Church‡." Again, therefore, this Universal Church has a sentiment: her sentiment carries along with it an infallible condemnation of the errors opposite thereunto, and serves as a rule for the decision of all the aforesaid articles.

89.—*This rule, according to the Minister, is sure, clear, sufficient, and the Faith it produces is not blind nor unreasonable.*

Besides this, there is another subject wherein this sentiment stands for a rule: "I believe that it is here also *the most sure rule* of judging which points be fundamental, and of distinguishing them from such as are not; so knotty, so difficult a question to resolve! Thus, all that Christians have unanimously believed, and do still everywhere believe, is fundamental and necessary to salvation."

---

* Syst. p. 237.

† Ibid.

‡ Ibid.

This rule is not only certain and clear, but very sufficient also; since the Minister, after having said that the discussion of texts, of versions, of interpretations of Scripture, and even the reading of this divine book, is not necessary to the believer in order to form his faith, concludes at last*, that "a simple woman, who has learnt the Apostles' Creed, and understood it in the sense of the Universal Church (withal keeping God's commandments), shall be, perhaps, in a more sure way than the learned, who, with so much ability, contend about the difference of versions."

There must be, therefore, an easy method of discovering what is believed by the Universal Church, since this discovery is within the reach of a simple woman. There is a security in this knowledge so discovered, since this simple woman relies upon and trusts to it; lastly, there is an entire sufficiency, since this woman has nothing to seek further, and, fully instructed in her faith, needs no otherwise to be concerned than how to live well. This belief is neither blind nor unreasonable, since it is founded on clear and sure principles; and in reality, when one is weak, as we all are, it is the most excellent pitch of reason to know well whom you may rely upon.

90.—*It can be no longer objected to us, that by following the authority of the Church we follow men.*

But let us push on this argument still further. That which makes an absolute certainty in matter of faith, a certainty of demonstration, and the best rule to decide truths by, must be clearly grounded on the word of God. Now, this kind of infallibility, which the Minister attributes to the Universal Church, imports a certainty absolute, and a certainty of demonstration, and it is the most sure rule whereby to decide the most essential, and withal the most knotty truths: therefore, it is clearly grounded on the word of God.

For the future, therefore, when we shall urge the Protestants with the authority of the Universal Church, should they object to us, that we follow the authority and traditions of men; their Minister will confound them by saying, with us, that following the Church universal is not following men, but God himself, who assists her by his spirit.

---

* Syst. l. iii. ch. iv. p. 463.

91.—*The idea which the Minister forms to himself of the Universal Church as he conceives it, is not agreeable with the sentiments of the Universal Church.*

If the Minister should answer, that we get nothing by this acknowledgment, because the Church, wherein he owns this infallibility, is not ours, and that all Christian communions enter into the notion which he gives of the Church: he will be no less confounded by his own principles, since he has but just placed among the conditions of the true faith, that the Creed be understood "in the sense of the Universal Church." We must therefore understand, in this sense, that article of the Creed, which speaks of the Universal Church herself. Now the Universal Church never has believed, that the Universal Church was the aggregate of all Christian sects: nor does the Minister find this notion in all places, or all times*; on the contrary, he is agreed that the notion which reduces the Church to a perfect unity, by excluding all sects from her communion, is of all ages, even of the three first: he has seen it in the two councils whose creeds he receives, namely, in that of Nice, and in that of Constantinople. It is not, therefore, in his sense, but in ours, that the simple woman, whom he makes to walk so surely in the way of salvation, ought to understand these words in the Creed, "the Catholic or Universal Church;" and when this good woman says, she believes therein, she is obliged to fix upon one certain communion, which God shall have distinguished from all the rest, and which contains in her unity none but the orthodox: a communion which must be the true kingdom of Christ Jesus perfectly united in itself, and opposite to the kingdom of Satan †, whose character, as before observed, is disunion.

92.—*The Minister condemns his Church by the characteristics ascribed by him to the Universal Church.*

Should the Minister think to escape by answering that, supposing we had proved a communion of this nature, we had done nothing as yet, since it still remained to be proved that this is our communion; I own, before we come to that, there are still some steps to be taken: but, in the meanwhile, and before we do this, and force the Minister, according to his principles, to take these steps with us; we find already in his principles, whereby to reject his Church. For when he gave us for a rule that which the Universal Church unanimously believes everywhere: lest he should comprehend the Socinians in this Universal Church, whose authority he opposed against them, he reduced this Church to "communions which are ancient and extensive [*]," exclusively of sects which have neither of these advantages, and which, "for this reason, could neither be called communions, nor Christian communions." Here are then two great characteristics, which, according to him, a communion ought to have to merit the denomination of Christian, antiquity and extent: now it is very certain, that the Churches of the Reformation were not, at the beginning, either ancient or extensive, no more than those of the Socinians and others which the Minister rejects; therefore, they were neither "Churches nor communions:" but if they were not so then, they could not become so afterwards: therefore, they are not so now, nor can one, consistently with the Minister's rules, too speedily forsake them.

---

* See n, 71, of this Book, et seq.

† Luke xi. 17.

93.—*All the Minister's means for defending his Churches are common to them with those of the Socinians and of other Sectaries rejected by the Reformation.*

It serves no purpose to answer, that these Churches had their predecessors in those great societies which were antecedent to them, and which preserved the fundamental verities; for it suits only with the Socinians to say as much. The Minister urges them in vain with these words [†], "Let these men name us a communion which has taught their dogma. To find out the succession of their doctrine, they begin by a Cerinthus; they continue by an Artemon, by a Paul of Samosata, by a Photinus, and other such like men, who never had an assembly of four thousand people, who never had a communion, and who were the abomination of the whole Church." When the Minister urges them thus, he is right in the main, but he is not right according to his principles, because the Socinians will always tell him, that the only fundamental point of salvation is to believe one only God, and one only mediator, Christ; that it is the unity of these tenets, which all the world agrees in, that makes the Church's unity; that the superadded tenets may, indeed, make particular confederations, but not another body of the Church universal; that their faith had subsisted, and does still subsist in all Christian societies; that they can live amongst the Calvinists, as the pretended elect of the Calvinists lived, before Calvin, in the Church of Rome; that they are no more obliged to shew, nor to reckon their predecessors, than the Lutherans or Calvinists; that it is not true, they were "the abomination of the whole Church;" since, besides their being a part thereof, the whole Church never had the power of assembling herself against them; the whole Church "teaches nothing, decides nothing," detests nothing; that all these functions appertain only to particular Churches; that he is in the wrong to find fault with them for clandestinity, or rather for the nullity of their assemblies; that those of the Lutherans or Calvinists at the beginning were in no respect different; that, after their example, they meet together when able, and where they have the liberty: which if others have extorted by bloody wars, their cause is never the better for that; and to annex salvation to such favour or toleration, howsoever obtained from prince or magistrate, whether by negotiation or force, is making Christianity to depend on policy.

---

[*] Syst. l. ii. ch. i. p. 238.

[†] Ibid.

94.—*Abridgment of the foregoing arguments.*

The Minister having taken these great steps, by never so little reflection upon his own principles, would soon join issue with us. The sentiment of the universal Church is a rule; it is a certain rule against the Socinians: therefore, an universal Church must be shewn in which the Socinians are not comprehended. What excludes them from it is the want of "extent or succession:" a succession, therefore, must be pointed out to them, which they cannot meet with amongst themselves: now they meet evidently with the same succession that Calvinists boast of; namely, a succession in the principles which are common to them with other sects; it is necessary, therefore, they should find out another; it is necessary, I say, that you should find a succession in the tenets peculiar to that sect whose antiquity you would establish. Now this succession agrees not with Calvinists, who, in their peculiar tenets, have no more succession, nor antiquity, than the Socinians: you must, therefore, go forth from theirs as well as from the Socinian Church: you must, therefore, be able to find out a better antiquity and succession than either of theirs. Finding this antiquity and this succession, you will have found the certainty of faith: all, therefore, you will have to do is, to rely on the sentiments of the Church, and on her authority; and what is all this else, I pray, but owning the Church infallible? This Minister leads us then by a sure way to the infallibility of the Church.

95.—*There is no restriction with respect to Dogmata in the Church's Infallibility.*

I am sensible he lays a restriction. "The universal Church (says he)* is infallible to a certain degree, as far as those bounds which divide fundamental truths from those which are not so." But we have already made it plain that this restriction is arbitrary. God hath not declared to us that he ever confined within these bounds the assistance which he promised to his Church, nor that he designed to limit his promises at the will of ministers. He gives his Holy Ghost, not to teach some truth, but to teach "all truth†," because he has revealed none but such as is useful and necessary in certain cases. Never, therefore, will he permit any one of these truths to be extinguished in the body of the universal Church.

96.—*What is once believed in the whole Church, was always believed in it.*

Wherefore, whatsoever doctrine I shall shew to have been once universally received, the minister must receive it according to his principles; and should he think to escape by answering that this doctrine, for instance, transubstantiation, the sacrifice, invocation of saints, veneration of images, and such like points, are indeed to be found in all the Oriental communions no less than in the Western Church, but yet were not always there, and that it is in this perpetuity that he has placed the stress of his proof and the infallibility of the universal Church: he must have misunderstood himself, because he could not have believed in the Church universal, a perpetual assistance of the Holy Ghost, without comprehending, in this acknowledgment, not only all times together, but also each time in particular: this perpetuity including them all: from whence it follows that, throughout the whole duration of the Church, he will never be able to point out a time, when the error prevails which the Holy Ghost has bound himself to preserve her from. Now it has been seen, the Holy Ghost has equally bound himself to preserve her from all error, nor from one more than another; therefore there never can be any.

97.—*The Catholic alone believes in the promises.*

What makes our adversaries stop at this, is their having nothing but a human and a wavering faith. But the Catholic, whose faith is divine and firm, will say without hesitating: if the Holy Ghost has promised his universal Church to assist her indefinitely against errors, therefore against *all:* and if against *all,* therefore *always:* and as often as one shall find, in any certain time, a doctrine established in the whole Catholic Church, such can never be impeached of novelty, but by error.

---

* P. 236. † John xvi. 13.

98.—*The Minister can no longer deny the Infallibility which he has confessed.*

We press him too home, will he say, and at last shall force him to forsake his principles of the universal Church's infallibility. God forbid he should forsake so true a principle, or that he should fall back into all the absurdities he sought to avoid by establishing it; for then his case would be that mentioned by St. Paul, "If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a prevaricator*." But since he has begun to take so wholesome a medicine, he must be made to follow it to the last drop, however bitter it may seem at present; that is, he must be shewn all the necessary consequences of that truth which he has once acknowledged.

99.—*The infallibility of general Councils a consequence from the infallibility of the Church.*

He puzzles himself about the infallibility of universal councils: but in the first place, supposing there were no councils, the minister is agreed that the Church's consent, even without being assembled, would serve for a certain rule. Her consent might be known, since he supposes it is so sufficiently at present, to condemn the Socinians, and to serve for an unalterable rule in the most knotty questions. Now, by the same means that the Socinians are condemned, the other sects may also be condemned. Nor, indeed, can it be denied that the whole Church, without assembling herself, has sufficiently condemned Novatian, Paul of Samosata, the Manicheans, the Pelagians, and an endless number of other sects. In like manner, what sect soever may arise, it may always be condemned like those, and the Church will be infallible in this condemnation, since her consent will be a rule. Secondly, by owning that the universal Church is infallible, how can the Councils not be so that represent her, which she receives, which she approves, wherein nothing else is proposed but to declare her sentiments in a lawful assembly?

---

* Gal. ii. 18.

100.—*Cavils against Councils.*

But this assembly is impossible, because there is no assembling all the pastors of the universe, and much less, so many opposite communions. What a chicanery! Did ever man take it into his head to require, in order to form an Œcumenical Council, that all pastors should be present at it? Is it not sufficient that so many come to it, and from so many places, and the rest so evidently consent to their assembly, as to become manifest that the judgment passed in it is the judgment of the whole earth? Who, therefore, can refuse his consent to such a Council, unless he that will say, Jesus Christ, contrary to his promise, has abandoned the whole Church? And if the Church's sentiment was of much force whilst diffused, of how much more will it be, when reunited!

101.—*Excessive and monstrous power given by the Minister to those who are rebels to the Church.*

Concerning what the Minister says about opposite communions, I have but one word to tell him. If the Universal Church be infallible in opposite communions, she would be much more so, remaining in her primitive unity. Let us, then, take her in this state; let us convene her pastors in the third century, before the Church was corrupted: before, if he pleases, that Novatian had separated from it: at such a time, he must allow the convention of such a council would have been a divine relief in order to prevent the progress of an error. Let us now suppose what came to pass: a proud Novatian makes himself bishop in a See already filled, and makes a sect that will reform the Church. He is expelled; is excommunicated: what then; because he continues to call himself a Christian, must he be of the Church in despite of her? Because he carries his insolence to the utmost extremes, and will listen to no kind of reason, must the Church have lost her first unity, nor be able any longer to assemble, nor to form an universal Council unless his proud heart consent? Must temerity have such a power? And will there need no more than to lop off a branch, nay, a rotten branch, to say that the tree has lost its unity and root?

102.—*The Council of Nice formed contrary to the Minister's principles.*

It is therefore a thing not to be questioned, that in spite of Novatian, in spite of Donatus, in spite of all other no less contentious than unreasonable men, the Church will have power to convene an Œcumenical Council. Will have it, do I say? Already has she exercised that power, and in despite of Novatian and Donatus held the Nicene Council. That it was necessary to call, and what is worse, to make the followers of those heresiarchs actually come to it, in order that the assembly might be lawfully held, is what was never so much as thought of. To trump up such a shift at this time of day, and thirteen hundred years after the whole world (the impious part excepted) has looked on this holy Council as universal; to maintain it was not so, nay, that it was impossible for the Catholic Church to hold such a council, because she could not assemble in it those rebels who had unjustly broken unity, is obliging her to depend on her enemies, and punish their rebellion on herself.

103.—*Remarkable words of a learned Englishman concerning the infallibility of the Nicene Council.*

Here is, then, a Council justly called universal, by consequence infallible, if so be the minister do not forget all he has just granted; and pleased I am with the opportunity of quoting to him what a learned Englishman, a staunch Protestant, has said to this purpose. "The matter under question in this Council was a main article of the Christian religion. If, in a question of this importance, it be imagined, that all the pastors of the Church could have fallen into error, and deceived all the faithful, how shall we be able to defend the word of Jesus Christ, who has promised his Apostles, and in their persons, his successors, to be always with them? A promise that would not be true, the Apostles not being to live so long a time, were it not that their successors are here comprehended in the persons of the Apostles themselves *;" which he confirms by a passage out of Socrates †, who says, "That the Fathers of this Council, although simple and not over-learned, could not fall into error, for that they were illuminated with the light of the Holy Ghost;" whereby he shews us all at once the infallibility of universal Councils by the Scripture and by the tradition of the ancient Church. May the blessing of God light on the learned Doctor Bull! and in recompence of this sincere acknowledgment, and withal of that zeal he has shewn in defence of Jesus Christ's divinity, may he be delivered from the prejudices which prevent him from opening his eyes to the lights of the Catholic Church, and to the necessary consequences of that truth he has confessed.

---

* Dr. Bull, def. fid. Nic. prœm. n. 2. p. 2. Ibid. n. 3.

† Socra. l. i. c. 9.

104.—*One may judge of other Councils by the Council of Nice.*

I do neither undertake the history nor the defence of all general councils; it suffices me to have remarked in one only, from avowed principles, what the attentive reader will easily extend to all the rest; and the least that can be concluded from this example is, that God having prepared in these assemblies so immediate an assistance to his troubled Church, it is renouncing faith in his providence to believe, that Schismatics may so alter the constitution of his Church, as that this remedy should become absolutely impossible to her.

105.—*The Minister forced to take from Pastors the title of Judges in matters of Faith.*

In order to enervate the authority of ecclesiastical judgments in matters of faith, Mr. Jurieu has ventured to say that they are not even judgments; that the pastors assembled in these cases are not judges, "but wise and experienced men, and that they act not with authority;" that the want of being let into this secret was the cause, that his brethren "have written with so little perspicuity on this subject;" and the reason he alleges for taking from councils the title of judges is, because "not being infallible, it is impossible they should be judges in decisions of faith, because the word 'judge' imports a person you must necessarily submit to*."

106.—*This Doctrine is contrary to the sentiments of his Churches.*

That the pastors are not judges in questions relative to faith, is what never has been heard of among Christians, nay, not so much as in the Reformation, where ecclesiastical authority is brought to so low an ebb. On the contrary, Mr. Jurieu himself produces us the words of the Synod of Dort †, wherein that Synod declares herself judge, and even "lawful judge, in the cause of Arminius," which certainly regarded faith.

We read also in the book of Discipline ‡, "that all the differences of a province shall be definitively judged, and without appeal, in its respective provincial Synod, except what regards suspensions and degradations. . . And likewise what concerns doctrine, the sacraments, and discipline in general ; all which cases may, step by step, be brought up to the national Synod to receive the definitive and last judgment," which, in another place, is called "the entire and final resolution*."

---

* Syst. l. iii. ch. ii. p. 243. ch. iii. p. 251. ch. iv. p. 258. Ibid. 243. p. 255.

† Ibid. p. 257. ‡ Disc. ch. viii. Art. x.

To say with Mr. Jurieu†, that the word "judgment" is here taken "in an extensive sense," for a report of experienced men, and not for a sentence "of judges having authority to bind men's consciences," is an insult on human language; for what must be called acting with authority, and binding consciences, if it be not to push things so far as to oblige the particular condemned persons‡ "to acquiesce from point to point, and with express disclaiming of their errors entered in a register, under penalty of being cut off from the Church?" Is this a judgment in an improper "and more extensive sense," and not rather a judgment in full rigour? And that the Synods have exerted this power, we have seen in the affair of Piscator§, they obliging him to subscribe a formulary which condemned his doctrine: we have seen in the affair of Arminius, and in the subscription required to the canons of the Synod of Dort; and all the registers of our reformed are full of the like subscriptions.

107.—*Subscriptions disapproved by the Minister notwithstanding the practice of his Churches.*

No other remedy has Mr. Jurieu found out for this but to say‖, "that when a Synod decides controversies which are not important, it ought never to oblige the condemned parties to subscribe, and to believe her decisions;" but this is contrary to the express terms of their Discipline, "which obliges to acquiesce from point to point, and with an express disclaiming of their errors entered in a register, under penalty of being severed from the Church;" which Mr. Jurieu himself understands "of less important controversies, which neither destroy nor hurt the foundation¶."

108.—*The Minister's evasion.*

It only remained to say, that "cutting off from the Church," in this place, was no more than cutting off from an arbitrary confederation**, contrary to the express words of their Discipline, which, explaining this cutting off in the same chapter, is acquainted with no other than that which severs a rotten member from the body, and ranks it among heathens, as already seen.

---

* Disc. ch. v. Art. xxxii. p. 114. † Syst. p. 257. ‡ Disc. Ibid. § S. l. xii. ‖ Syst. p. 306. ¶ Ibid. p. 270. ** Ibid. p. 269. Ibid. Art. xvii.

109.—*Infallibility proved by the principles of the Minister.*

Wherefore it is but too manifest that this minister has changed the maxims of the sect. Let us now restore them, and joining them to the minister's own principles, we shall clearly find infallibility confessed. By the minister's principles, if councils were judges in matters of faith, they would be infallible*: now, by the principles of his Church, they are judges; therefore, the minister either must condemn himself, or his Church, if he allow not the infallibility of councils, of those at least, wherein is the last and final resolution: but though he should have bereft the pastors assembled of the title of judges, so as to leave them nothing but that of experienced men, yet the councils would be but the better authorised by his doctrine, there being not a man of sound sense that would not hold himself for at least as rash, in resisting the sentiment of all experienced men, as in resisting the sentence of all judges.

110.—*Strange expression of the Minister, who will have us sacrifice Truth to Peace.*

He is not less perplexed about the letters of submission, which the deputies of all provincial Synods are to carry to the national one in good form, and in these terms†:—"We promise before God to submit ourselves to all that shall be concluded and resolved in your holy assembly, persuaded, as we are, that God will there preside, and will lead you into all truth and equity by the rule of his word." The last words demonstrate that the matter in hand was religion; nor any longer can we learn what it is to be judges, nay, and sovereign judges, if men to whom such an oath is taken be not so. I have elsewhere shewn‡ that they exacted it in full rigour; that many provinces were censured for having made a difficulty of submitting "to the clause of approbation, of submission and obedience;" and that they were obliged "to make it in specific terms to all that should be concluded and decreed, without condition or modification." These words are so pressing, that after so long torturing himself to expound them, Mr. Jurieu at length comes to say*, "that they promise this submission on regulations of discipline relating to things indifferent, or, at furthest, no less important controversies, which do not destroy nor hurt the foundation of faith;" so that, concludes he, "it is not strange that in such sort of things we pay the Synod an entire submission, because, in controversies which are not of the utmost importance, we ought to sacrifice truths to the good of peace."

---

* Sup. n. 105. S. 106, et seq.

† Disc. p. 144.

‡ Expos. ch. xix. Conference with Mr. Claude, pp. 52, 337.

Sacrifice truths, and the revealed truths of God! Either he knows not what he says, or he blasphemes. To sacrifice heavenly truths, if this be to renounce them, and subscribe the condemnation of them, it is a blasphemy. There is no truth revealed of God that does not deserve, so far from sacrificing it, that we should sacrifice ourselves for it. But perchance to sacrifice them, is to hold one's tongue. The expression is much too violent. Let it pass, however, provided this will satisfy: but the Synod will come upon you "after her last and final resolution," and press you in virtue of their Discipline and your own solemn oath, "to acquiesce from point to point, and with an express disclaiming of your opinion authentically entered in a register," in order to prevent all equivocation, under penalty of being cut off from God's people, and accounted as a heathen. What will you do, if unable to make your judgment bend to that of the Church? Certainly, either you will subscribe and betray your conscience, or speedily you alone will be your whole Church.

111.—*The Confession of Faith always put to the question in all Synods.*

Besides, when the minister tells us †, that the points of controversy which are submitted to the Synod, are not those which are contained in the "Confession of Faith," he does not reflect how many times they would have changed them in important articles out of complaisance to the Lutherans. Nay, more, he has forgotten the custom of all their Synods, wherein the first point put to debate always is, upon reading the Confession of Faith, to examine whether there be anything to be corrected in it. The fact was put to Mr. Claude ‡, nor was it denied by him, and besides this, it is manifest by the acts of all the Synods. Who will now wonder that nothing has escaped change in the new Reformation, since, notwithstanding so many books written, and so many Synods held, they are every day still to seek and deliberate anew about their faith?

---

* Syst. pp. 270, 271.

† Ibid. p. 270.

‡ Conference with Mr. Claude, p. 378.

112.—*The weak constitution of the Reformation forces at length the Ministers to change their Capital Dogma, viz. the necessity of the Scripture.*

But nothing will set in a plainer light the feeble constitution of their Church, than the change I am now about to relate. Nothing amongst them is more essential, nor more fundamental, than to oblige each one to form his faith on the reading of the Scripture. But one sole question proposed to them has, at length, withdrawn them from this principle. Now, they were asked, what could be those people's faith, who as yet had neither read the Scripture nor heard it read, but were just entering on the reading of it? There needed no more than this to put them manifestly to a stand.

To say, that in this state, one has no faith, with what disposition, then, and in what spirit, will such a man read the holy Scripture? But if you say, he has, whence has he received it? All they had to answer was*, "that the Christian doctrine, taken in the whole, makes itself be felt; that to form an act of faith on the divinity of Scripture, it is not necessary to have read it †; that it suffices to have read a summary of Christian doctrine without descending to particulars; that those who wanted the Scripture, had it nevertheless in their power to become good Christians; that the Gospel doctrine makes its divinity be felt by the simple, independently of the book where it is contained in; that supposing this doctrine were mixed with things not divine but useless, the pure and celestial doctrine blended with it would nevertheless make itself be felt; that conscience relishes truth, after which the faithful man believes such a book to be canonical, because he has found truths that sensibly affect him; in a word, that one feels truth as he feels the light in seeing it; heat, sitting near the fire; sweet and bitter, in eating."

113.—*Their Faith no longer formed on Scripture.*

Heretofore it was an inextricable difficulty for the ministers to resolve this question; whether or no it is requisite, if faith be to be formed on Scripture, to have read all the books thereof? And, if sufficient to have read some of them, which are those privileged ones we must read preferably to the rest, in order to form our faith? But they have rid themselves of this perplexity by saying, there is not even a necessity of reading any one of them; nay, they have carried it so far as to make a believer form his faith without so much as knowing which are the books inspired by God.

---

* Syst. p. 428.

† Ibid. p. 453, et seq.

114.—*The people have no further necessity of discerning Apocryphal from Canonical Books.*

Their thoughts were too much busied about the Confession of Faith, when they said, speaking of the divine books *, "that they were known for canonical, not so much from the consent of the Church, as from the testimony and interior persuasion of the Holy Ghost." The ministers, it seems, are sensible at present that this was all illusion, and how little likelihood there is, that the faithful should be capable, by their interior relish, and without the assistance of tradition, to discern from a profane book, the Canticle of Canticles, or to feel the divinity of the first chapters of Genesis, and so forth; accordingly, it is decided at present, "that the examination of the question touching Apocryphal books, is not necessary for the people." Mr. Jurieu † has written a chapter expressly to prove it; and so far is it from being requisite to torment one's self about books Canonical or Apocryphal, about text or version, or to be at the pains of discussing Scripture, or even reading it, that the Christian truths, provided you only put them together, will of themselves make you feel them as you feel cold and heat.

115.—*The importance of this change.*

Mr. Jurieu says all this; and what is more remarkable, says it but after Mr. Claude. And since these two ministers have concurred together in this point, which is as much as to say, that the party had but this sole refuge; let us stop a while to consider whence they set out, and whither they are arrived. The ministers heretofore built faith on Scripture ‡; now they form it without the Scripture. It was said in the Confession of Faith, speaking of Scripture §, that "all things ought to be examined, regulated, and reformed according to it;" now, not the sentiment, which men have of things, ought to be proved by Scripture, but Scripture itself is not known, nor perceived to be Scripture, otherwise than by the sentiment you have of things before you know the divine books; and religion is formed without them.

---

* Confess. Art. iv.

† Syst. l. iii. Ib. ch. ii. p. 3.

‡ Def. of the Ref. part ii. ch. ix. p. 296. et seq.

§ Confession of Faith, Art. v.

116.—*Manifest Fanaticism*

This testimony, imagined by men to proceed from the Holy Ghost, whereby to discern divine Scripture from not divine, was held deservedly for fanaticism and a means of deceit; because this testimony, not being annexed to any positive proof, there was not a man that could not either boast of it without reason, or fancy it to himself without grounds. But the case is now much worse; whereas they said formerly, "let us see what is written, and then we will believe;" which was beginning at least by something positive and a certain fact: now, they begin by feeling things in themselves as you feel cold and heat, sweet and bitter; and when afterwards they come to read the Scripture in this disposition, God knows with what facility they turn it to what they already hold for as certain as what they have seen with their eyes and touched with their hands.

117.—*Neither Miracles, nor Prophecies, nor Scripture, nor Tradition necessary to authorize and declare Revelation.*

According to this presupposition, viz., truths necessary to salvation make themselves be felt by themselves, Jesus Christ needed not miracles, nor prophecies: Moses would have been believed, though the Red Sea had not divided itself, though the rock had not poured out torrents of water at the first touch of the wand; they had nothing to do but to propose the Gospel or the law. No more had the fathers of Nice and Ephesus, than to propose the Trinity and Incarnation, provided they proposed it with all the other mysteries; the researches into Scripture and tradition, which they made with so much care, were needless to them: on the bare exposition of truth, grace would have commanded the assent of all the faithful; God inspires all he pleases into whom he pleases, and inspiration of itself alone can do all things.

118.—*The Grace necessary to produce Faith, why annexed to certain exterior means and matters of fact.*

This was not the thing doubted of, and the power of God was well known to Catholics, no less than the necessity men stood in, of his inspiration and grace. The business was to find out the external means it makes use of, and whereto God has been pleased to annex it: one may feign or imagine that he is inspired of God without being really so; but he cannot feign, nor imagine that the sea divides itself, that the earth opens, the dead arise, those born blind receive sight, that he reads such a thing in a book, and that such and such our predecessors in the faith have so understood it; that the whole Church believes, and always has believed it so. The question, therefore, at issue is, not whether those external means be sufficient without grace and divine inspiration, for none pretends that: but, in order to hinder men from feigning or imagining an inspiration, whether it has not been God's economy, and his usual conduct to make his inspiration walk hand in hand with certain means of fact, which men can neither feign in the air without being convicted of falsehood, nor imagine without illusion. This is not the place to determine which are these facts, which these external means, which the motives of belief, since it is already certain there are some such, for the minister hath agreed to it; it is, I say, agreed, not only that there are such certain facts, but moreover that those certain facts may serve for an infallible rule. For instance, according to him, it is a certain fact that the Christian Church has always believed the divinity of Jesus Christ, the soul's immortality, and the eternity of pains, with such and such other articles: but this certain fact, according to him, is an infallible rule, and the best of all rules, not only to decide all these articles, but also to resolve the obscure and knotty question concerning fundamentals. We have seen the passages where the Minister teaches and proves this*; but when he teaches thus, and allows the universal consent to be "the most sure rule" of judging these important and knotty questions; yet, in proposing this external motive, which, according to him, implies demonstration, he did not aim at excluding grace and inward inspiration: the question, therefore, is, whether the authority of the Church, which joined to the grace of God is a sufficient motive and "most sure of all rules" in certain points, may not be so in all; and whether, setting up an inspiration exclusive of all these exterior means, and whereof you give yourself and your own sentiment for surety to yourself and others, be not the best plea that can possibly be put into the mouths of false teachers, the surest illusion to drive headstrong men to the utmost extremes.

---

* S. n. 38. et seq.

119.—*The language of the Ministers loosens the reins to the People's licentiousness.*

After having put it into the people's head that they are particularly inspired by God ; to complete the thing you need but also tell them that they may make themselves guides as they think fit, may depose all those that are appointed them, may set up others to act by such powers as they judge meet to communicate. It is what has been done in the Reformation. Mr. Claude and Mr. Jurieu do also agree together in this doctrine.

120.—*The language of the Catholic Church concerning the settlement of Pastors.*

The Catholic Church thus speaks to the Christian people. Ye are a people, a state, and a society: but Jesus Christ, who is your king, holds nothing of you, and his authority is derived from a higher source : naturally, you have no more right to give him ministers than you have to appoint him your prince ; thus his ministers, who are your pastors, derive their descent still higher as he himself does, and it is necessary they should come by an order of his appointment. The kingdom of Jesus Christ is not of this world, nor can a comparison be made between his kingdom and those of the earth, which is not defective ; in a word, nature affords us nothing that bears a conformity with Jesus Christ and his kingdom, nor have you any other right than that which you shall find in the laws or customs immemorial of your society. Now, these customs immemorial, to begin from the Apostolic times, are, that the pastors already constituted should constitute others : "Choose ye," say the Apostles, "and we shall appoint *;" it was Titus's business to appoint the pastors of Crete ; and it was from Paul, appointed by Jesus Christ, that he received this power. "For this cause," says he, "left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest reform the things that are wanting, and ordain priests in every city, as I had appointed thee †." Besides, those who flatter you with the notion that your consent is absolutely necessary to constitute your pastors, do not believe what they tell you, since they acknowledge those of England for true pastors, though the people has had no share in their election. The example of St. Mathias, extraordinarily chosen by a divine lot, ought not to be made a precedent, nay, even then, all was not left to the people, for Peter, already established pastor by Jesus Christ, held the assembly: neither was it election that constituted Mathias; it was heaven which declared itself. Everywhere else, the authority of constituting is given to pastors already constituted: the power, which they have from above, is rendered sensible by the imposition of hands, a ceremony reserved to their order. It is thus that pastors follow successively one another: Jesus Christ, who appointed the first, has said that he would always be with those to whom they should transmit their power; ye cannot have pastors anywhere but in this succession, nor any more ought ye to apprehend its failing, than that the Church herself, preaching, and the sacraments, should fail.

---

* Acts vi. 3, 6, 7.

† Tit. i. 5.

121.—*Language of the Reformation.*

Thus speaks the Church, nor do the people presume beyond what is given them: but the Reformation speaks to them quite the contrary. In you, says she, is the source of celestial power; ye may not only present, but constitute your pastors. Should proofs of this power, in the people, be required from the Scriptures, she would be at a stand. To exempt herself from this task, she tells the people that it is a natural right of all societies; so that, to enjoy it, there is no need of Scripture, it being sufficient that Scripture has not recalled this right allowed by nature. The turn is cunning, I must own; but beware of it, ye people, who are fed with this delusion! To make yourselves a lord on earth, it suffices to acknowledge him for such, and every man carries this power in his own will. But the case is not the same in making yourselves a Christ, a Saviour, a celestial King, and appointing him his ministers. And will ye then, indeed, ye people, impose your hands on them on being told it appertains to you to appoint them? They dare not: but are again encouraged, when assured this ceremony of impotion of hands is not necessary. What! is it not sufficient to judge it necessary, that you so often find it in Scripture, and do not find, either in Scripture or in all tradition, that ever pastor was made any other way, no, not one but was made by other pastors? No matter, do it nevertheless, O people! believe ye that the power of loosing and binding, of appointing and rejecting, is in you, and that your pastors have no power but as your representatives; that the authority of their Synods flows from you, that they are no more than your delegates; believe, I say, all these things, although you find not a word thereof in Scripture; and believe, beyond everything else, that, when you shall think yourselves inspired by God to reform the Church, whensoever you shall be assembled in whatsoever way, you have power to do with your pastors just what you please, none having right to deprive you of this liberty, it being derived from nature. Thus is the Reformation preached; thus is Christianity destroyed root and branch, and the way paved for Antichrist.

122.—*The Sects issuing from the Reformation, proofs of her evil constitution.—Comparison of the Ancient Church ill alleged.*

With such maxims and such a spirit (for although it shoots out more manifest in our days, the root was always the same in the Reformation), it is no longer to be wondered that we have seen it, from its first origin, run from change to change, productive of so many sects of so many kinds. Mr. Jurieu has had the face to answer, that herein, as in all other things, it resembles the primitive Church*. In good truth, this is too notoriously abusing the people's credulity and the venerable name of the primitive Church. The sects which divided from her were not the consequence or natural effect of her constitution. Two kinds of sects did arise in primitive Christianity; some purely heathen in their foundation, as that of the Valentinians, the Simonians, the Manicheans, and others of that stamp which entered themselves, in appearance, on the list of Christians, only to set themselves off with the great name of Jesus Christ; nor have these sects anything in common with those of the latter ages. The other sectaries, for the most part, were Christians, which, unable to bear the loftiness, and, as I may say, the whole weight of faith, sought to ease reason now of one article, then of another: thus, some deprived Christ of his divinity; others, unable to unite the divinity and humanity, mutilated, as it were, in divers ways, both one and the other. Against the like rocks split the proud spirit of Martin Luther. He sunk in reconciling grace and free-will, which, in truth, is a grand mystery: he kept no compass in matter of predestination, and no longer saw anything for men but a fatal and inevitable necessity, wherein good and evil are equally comprehended. We have seen how these extravagant maxims produced those of the Calvinists, still more extravagant. When laying aside all temper, by carrying to extremes predestination and grace, men fell into such visible excesses as were no longer to be supported : the horror they conceived thereof cast them into the opposite extreme ; and from Luther's excess, who went beyond bounds with grace (however incredible it may seem), they passed to the excess of the Demipelagians, who destroy it. Whence have we the Arminians, who, in our days, have produced the Pajonists, Pelagians complete, whose author was Mr. Pajon, the late minister of Orleans. On the other side, the same Luther, cast down by the force of these words,—"This is my body, this is my blood," could not find in his heart to reject the Real Presence ; but at the same time was resolved, in compliance with human sense, to rid it of the change of substance. Things stopped not there; and the Real Presence was soon assaulted. Human sense took a pleasure in its own inventions, and its exceptions being satisfied with regard to one mystery, stood up for the same concession in all the rest. As Zuinglius and his followers pretended that the Real Presence was a remnant of Popery still to be reformed in Lutheranism, the Socinians now a days say the same of the Trinity and Incarnation ; and these great mysteries, which had stood free from all insult of heresy for twelve hundred years, are entered on the footing of disputable points in an age when all kind of novelties think they have a right to shew their heads.

---

* History of Calvin, part i. ch. iv.

123.—*Socinians united with the Anabaptists, and both of them deriving their origin from Luther and Calvin.*

We have seen the illusions of the Anabaptists, and are sensible it was by following the principles of Luther and the rest of the Reformers that they rejected baptism without immersion, and infant baptism ; for this reason, that they did not find them in the Scripture, where they were made believe all was contained. The Unitarians or Socinians united with them, yet not so as to keep within the limits of their maxims, because the principles they had borrowed from the Reformers led them much further.

Mr. Jurieu remarks that they came forth a long while since the Reformation, from the midst of the Church of Rome. Where is the wonder ! Luther and Calvin came forth from her as well as they. The question is, whether the constitution of the Church of Rome was the cause of these innovations, and not rather the new Church-frame set up by the Reformers. Now this question is easily decided by the history of Socinianism*. In 1545, and in the years subsequent to this date, twenty years after that Luther had removed the bounds set by our forefathers, when all minds were in a ferment, and the world, teeming with novelty from his disputes, was always ready to bring forth some strange offspring, Lelio Socini and his companions held their clandestine conventicles in Italy against the divinity of the Son of God. George Blandrate and Fausto Socini, Lelio's nephew, maintained this doctrine in 1558 and in 1573, and formed the party. By the same method employed by Zuinglius to elude these words, "This is my body," the Socinians and their followers eluded those by which Christ is called God. If Zuinglius believed himself forced to the figurative interpretation by the impossibility of comprehending a human body whole and entire everywhere that the Eucharist was distributed, the Unitarians believed they had the same right over all the other mysteries equally incomprehensible; and after it had been set them for a rule to understand figuratively those passages of Scripture which bore hard on human reasoning, they did but extend this rule to whatsoever the mind of man had to suffer the like violence from. To these evil dispositions introduced by the Reformation, let us join the general foundations it had laid, the authority of the Church despised, the succession of pastors held for nothing, precedent ages impeached of error, the Fathers themselves basely handled, all fences laid open, and human curiosity abandoned entirely to itself; what else could be the issue but what has been seen, namely, an unbridled licentiousness in all matters of religion? But experience has proved that these hardy innovators saw not the least possibility of settling amongst us; it was to the Churches of the Reformation they betook themselves; those upstart Churches, which, set in motion, and still giddy with their own changes, were susceptible of all others. It was in the bosom of these Churches, at Geneva, amongst the Switzers and the Polish Protestants, that the Unitarians sought a sanctuary. Repulsed by some of these Churches, they raised themselves a sufficient number of disciples amongst the rest of them to make a separate body. This, beyond question, was their origin. You need but look into the Testament of George Schoman, one of the Unitarian chiefs, and the account given by Andrew Wissonats, "in what manner the Unitarians separated themselves from the Reformed*," to be convinced that this sect was nothing but a progress of, and a sequel from the dogmata of Luther, of Calvin, of Zuinglius, of Menon, the last of whom was one of the heads of the Anabaptists. There you will find all those sects were but "the first draught, and, as it were, the dawn of the Reformation, and that Anabaptism, joined to Socinianism, is the mid-day *."

---

* Vid. Bibl. Anti-Trinit.

---

* Test. Georg. Sch. et relat. Wisson. in Biblioth. Anti-Trin. Sand. pp. 191, 209.

124.—*Constitution of the Reformation how unlike to that of the Primitive Church.*

No longer, therefore, let them object to us the sects of the ancient Church, and no longer boast of resembling her. Never did the ancient Church vary in her doctrine; never, in her confessions of faith, did she suppress the truths which she believed were revealed by God; she never retouched her decisions, never deliberated anew on matters once determined; never, no not once, proposed new expositions of faith, save when some new question arose. But the Reformation, quite on the contrary, never could content herself; her creeds have nothing that is certain; the decrees of her synods nothing fixed; her confessions of faith are confederacies and arbitrary contracts; what is an article of faith amongst them, is not so for all, nor always—they go apart by caprice, and meet again by policy. When, therefore, sects arose in the ancient Church, it was from the common and inveterate depravation of mankind; and when they now arise in the Reformation, it is from the novel and particular constitution of the Churches she has modelled.

125.—*A memorable instance of Variation in the Protestant Church of Strasburg.*

To make this truth the more apparent, I shall choose for an example the Protestant Church of Strasburg, as one of the most learned of the Reformation, and by her proposed, ever since the beginning, as a pattern of discipline to all the rest. This great city was one of the first that fell by Luther's preaching, and did not think, at that time, of disputing the Real Presence. All the complaints made against her senate were, that "it took away images, and made communion be given in both kinds †." It was in 1523 that, by the means of Bucer and Capito, she turned Zuinglian. After she had for some years heard their invectives against the Mass, without wholly abolishing it, and without a full assurance of its being evil, the senate decreed "it should be suspended until it were proved a worship acceptable to God*." Here is a very new provision in matter of faith; and though I had not mentioned that this decree came from the senate, it would easily have been understood, that the assembly where it was made was nothing less than ecclesiastical. The decree passed in 1529. The same year, those of Strasburg †, having never been able to agree with the Lutherans, joined in a league with the Swiss, who were Zuinglians like themselves. So far did they carry Zuinglius's notion and their hatred of the Real Presence, as to refuse to subscribe the Confession of Augsburg in 1530‡, and to make themselves a particular Confession, which we have seen under the name of the Confession of Strasburg, or of the four towns§. The very next year||, they shuffled so much, and with so much art on this subject, as to get themselves comprehended in the league of Smalcald, from which the rest of the Sacramentarians were excluded. But they went still further in 1536, inasmuch as they subscribed the Wittemberg agreement, wherein, as we have seen, was confessed the substantial presence and the communion of the true body and true blood in the unworthy, although void of faith¶. Thereby they passed over insensibly to Luther's sentiment, and from that time were counted among the defenders of the Confession of Augsburg which they subscribed. They declared, nevertheless, in 1548**, that this was without departing from their first Confession, which, although formerly it had made them reject that of Augsburg, was found conformable to it now. In the mean time, Strasburg was so wedded to the agreement of Wittemberg and the Confession of Augsburg††, that Peter Martyr and Ranchius, the two greatest men at that time of the Sacramentarians, were forced at length to withdraw from that city; one for refusing to subscribe the agreement, and the other for having subscribed the Confession with a restriction; so zealous were they become at Strasburg for the Real Presence. In 1598, this city subscribed the book of Concord; and after having been for so long a time the chief, as it were, of those cities that opposed the Real Presence, she stretched her Confession, in spite of Sturmius, to the prodigious tenet of Ubiquity‡‡." The cities of Linden and Memmingen, formerly her associates in the hatred of the Real Presence, followed this example*. At this time the ancient Agenda was changed, and Marbachius's book was printed at Strasburg, in which he maintained that "Jesus Christ, before his ascension, was in Heaven, as to his humanity; that this visible ascension was nothing, in reality, but an appearance; that the Heaven wherein Jesus Christ's humanity was received, contained not only God and all the saints, but moreover all the devils and all the damned; and that Jesus Christ was, according to his human nature, not only in the bread and wine of the Supper, but also in all the pots and all the glasses." To these extremities were men driven, when, forsaking the sure guidance of Church authority, they gave themselves up to human opinions like to a changeable and impetuous wind.

---

* Test. Georg. Sch. et relat. Wisson. in Biblioth. Anti-Trin. Sand. pp. 191, 209.

† Sleid. lib. iv. fol. 60.

---

* Sleid. lib. vi. fol. 93.
† Ibid. fol. 100.
‡ Ibid. lib. viii. fol. 104.
§ S. lib. iii. n. 3.
|| Sleid. lib. viii. fol. 125.
¶ S. lib. iv. n. 23. Hosp. part ii. An. 1536.
** Hosp. An. 1548. fol. 203.
†† Ibid. An. 1556 et 1563.
‡‡ Ibid. Conc. discors. c. lvi. p. 278.

126.—*Constancy of the Catholic Church.*

If now, to the variations and giddiness of these new Churches, you oppose the constancy and gravity of the Catholic Church, it will easily be judged where it is the Holy Ghost presides; and because I neither can, nor ought to relate, in this work, all the judgments she has passed in matters of faith, that uniformity and steadiness I commend her for, shall be made appear in those very articles wherein we have seen the inconstancy of our Reformed.

127.—*Example in the Question moved by Berengarius concerning the Real Presence.*

The first who made a sect in the Church, and dared to condemn her, in regard to the Real Presence, was unquestionably Berengarius. What our adversaries say of Ratramnus † is nothing less than a certain fact, as above seen; and, though it were granted that Ratramnus favoured them, (which is false,) an ambiguous author, by all of them made to speak in behalf of their several opinions, would be in nowise proper to make a sect. I say the same of John Scot, whose error was personal, and had no continued succession.

128.—*The Church's behaviour in regard of Innovators.*

The Church does not always anathematize rising errors; nor does she censure them as long as there are hopes they will vanish of themselves; nay, often fears rendering them famous by her anathemas. Thus Artemon, and some others who had denied Jesus Christ's divinity before Paul of Samosata, drew not such signal condemnations on themselves as he did, they not being judged capable of raising a sect. As for Berengarius, certain it is he attacked openly the Church's faith, and had disciples of his own name like other heresiarchs, although his heresy was soon extinguished.

---

* Hosp. Conc. discors. c. lvi. fol. 99.

† S. lib. iv. n. 32.

129.—*Beginning of Berengarius's Sect, and his Condemnation.*

It appeared about the year 1030; not but that we have already remarked, some years before, even from the year 1017, the Real Presence manifestly impugned by the heretics of Orleans, who were Manicheans*. Such were the first authors of that doctrine, one article of which was maintained by Berengarius. But as that sect kept concealed, the Church was surprised at this novelty, yet not much disturbed with it at that time. It was against Berengarius that the first decision was made on this subject in 1052, in a council of a hundred and thirteen bishops called together at Rome from all sides by Nicholas II.† Berengarius submitted himself, and the first who made a sect of the Sacramentarian heresy, was the first also that condemned it.

No one is ignorant of that famous Confession of Faith, which begins "Ego Berengarius," where this Heresiarch acknowledges, "that the bread and the wine which are placed on the altar after consecration are not only the sacrament, but also the true body and the true blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and are sensibly touched by the hands of the priest, broken and bruised between the teeth of the faithful, not only in sacrament, but in truth."

130.—*First Confession of Faith required of Berengarius.*

There were none but understood, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ was broken in the Eucharist, in the same sense that we say a man is torn, he is wet, when the clothes he actually wears are torn or wet. When his clothes are not on him, we use not the same way of speaking: so that the meaning was, that Jesus Christ was as truly under the species, which are broken and eaten, as we are truly in the clothes we wear. It was said, moreover, that Jesus Christ is sensibly received and touched, because he is in person and in substance under the sensible species which are touched and received; and all this imported that Jesus Christ is received and eaten, not in his proper species and under the exterior of man, but under a foreign species, and under the exterior of bread and wine. And if the Church said also, in a certain sense, that the body of Jesus Christ is broken, it was not from her being ignorant that, in another sense, it was not so: just as when saying, in a certain sense, we are torn and wet when our clothes are so; we are still sensible, at the same time, that, in another sense, we are neither one nor the other, as to our persons. Thus the Fathers justly said to Berengarius what we still say*, "that the body of Jesus Christ is all entire in the whole Sacrament, and all entire in every article thereof; everywhere the same Jesus Christ always entire, inviolable and indivisible, communicating himself without dividing himself, as the word to a whole audience, and as our soul to all our members." But what obliged the Church to say, after many Fathers, and after St. Chrysostom, that the body of Jesus Christ is broken, was, that Berengarius, under pretext of doing honour to the Saviour of the world, was accustomed to say†, "God forbid that man may break with the tooth, or divide Jesus Christ, in the same manner as we put under the tooth, and divide these things," namely, the bread and wine. The Church, which always took care to combat in heretics the most precise and strongest words they made use of to explain their error, opposed against Berengarius the contradictory of that proposition he had advanced, and placed in some manner the Real Presence under the eyes of Christians, by saying to them what they received in the sacrament, after consecration, was as really the body and the blood, as before consecration it was really bread and wine.

---

* S. lib. xi. n. 17, et seq.

† Concil. Rom. sub Nic. II. An. 1059. t. ix. Con. Lab. Guit. lib. iii. t. xviii. Bib. PP. Max. p. 462, &c.

131.—*Berengarius's second Confession of Faith, where the change of Substance is more clearly explained, and why.*

Besides, when the faithful were told that the bread and wine of the Eucharist were in truth the body and the blood, they were accustomed to understand, not that they were so by their nature, but became such by the consecration, so that the change of substance was contained in that expression, although what principally was aimed at by it, was to render the presence sensible, which likewise was principally impugned. Some while after it was perceptible that Berengarius and his disciples varied. For we learn from authors of those times* that, in the course of the dispute, they acknowledged in the Eucharist the substance of the body and blood, but with that of bread and wine, employing even the term of impanation and that of invination, and asserting that Jesus Christ was, as I may say, impanate in the Eucharist, as he became incarnate in the Virgin's womb. This, says Guitmondus †, was as a last intrenchment to Berengarius; nor was it without difficulty that this subtlety of the sect was discovered. But the Church, which always follows heretics step by step to condemn their errors as they disclose them, after having so well established the Real Presence in Berengarius's first Confession of Faith, proposed also another to him, in which the change of substance was expressed more distinctly. He confessed, therefore, under Gregory VII., in a Council held at Rome ‡, which was the sixth held under that Pope in 1079, "That the bread and wine, which are placed on the altar, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of Jesus Christ, are substantially changed into the true, life-giving, and proper flesh of Jesus Christ, &c." And the same is said of the blood. It is specified that the body here received "is the same that was born of the Virgin, that was nailed to the cross, that is seated at the right hand of the Father, and the blood is the same that flowed from his side;" and in order that no room might be left for equivocation, whereby heretics delude mankind, it is added, this is done "not in sign and in virtue by a simple sacrament, but in the propriety of nature and the truth of substance."

---

* Guit. lib. i. adv. Beren. Bib. PP. t. xviii. pp. 443, 449.

† Ber. apud Guit. Ibid. p. 441.

132.—*The change of Substance was opposed to Berengarius from the beginning.*

Berengarius again subscribed, and this second time condemned himself; but he was now so hampered, that no room for equivocation was left him, no subterfuge for his error. And if the change of substance was here insisted on more precisely, it was not that the Church had before in the least doubted of it, since, from the beginning of the dispute against Berengarius, Hugo of Langres had said*, "that the bread and wine did not remain in their first nature, but pass into another; that they were changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ by the omnipotence of God, against which Berengarius opposed himself in vain." And as soon as ever this heretic had declared himself, Adelman, Bishop of Bresse, his schoolfellow, and the first discoverer of his error, warned him†, "that he stood in opposition to the sense of the whole Catholic Church, and that it was as easy for Jesus Christ to change the bread into his body, as to change water into wine, and create light by his word alone." It was, therefore, a constant doctrine of the universal Church, not that the bread and wine contained the body and blood of Jesus Christ, but that they became his body and blood by a change of substance.

---

* Guit. ante pp. 441, 442, 462, 463, 464. Alg. de Sac. Corp. et Sang. Præf. t. xxi. p. 251.

† Ibid.

‡ Conc. Rom. vi. sub Greg. VII. t. x. Conc. Lab. An. 1079.

133.—*A certain fact, that the Faith opposed to Berengarius was that of the whole Church and of all Christians.*

Nor was it Adelman only that reproached Berengarius with the novelty and singularity of his doctrine; all authors unanimously upbraid him as with a certain fact, that the faith he impugned was that of the whole universe; that he scandalized the whole Church by the novelty of his doctrine; that to come over to his faith, it was necessary to believe there was no such thing as a Church on earth; that there was not so much as one town, no, not one village of his opinion; that the Greeks, the Armenians, in a word, all Christians had, in this regard, the same faith with those of the west; so that nothing could be more ridiculous than to censure, as incredible, what was believed by the whole world. Nor did Berengarius deny this fact, but, like all heretics, answered disdainfully, that wise men ought not to follow "the sentiments, or rather the follies, of the vulgar." But Lanfranc and the rest of them remonstrated, that what he called the vulgar, was the whole clergy and all the people of the universe; and upon the certainty of this fact, wherein he feared no contradiction, he concluded, that if Berengarius's doctrine were true, "the inheritance promised to Jesus Christ was made void, and his promises annihilated;" lastly, that "the Catholic Church was no more, and, if she was no more, she never had been‡."

---

* Bib. PP. Max. t. xviii. p. 417.

† Ibid. pp. 438, 439.

‡ Ascel. Ep. ad Ber. Guit. Ibid. lib. iii. pp. 462, 463. Lanfranc de Corp. et Sang. Dom. Ibid. c. ii. iv. v. xxii. pp. 765, 766, 776. Ibid. c. iv. p. 765. Ibid. c. xxii. p. 776.

134.—*All Innovators always find the Church in a full and constant possession of that Doctrine they attack.*

A remarkable fact likewise may be here observed; namely, that Berengarius, like all other heretics, found the Church firm and universally united in the dogma which he impugned; this is what has always happened in like cases. Of all the dogmata which we believe, not so much as one can be named, which was not found invincibly and universally established when the contrary dogma began to make a sect; and wherein the Church has not remained, if possible, still more fixed from that very time, a thing alone sufficient to make palpable the perpetual succession and immutability of her faith.

135.—*There was no need of an universal Council against Berengarius.*

There was not more necessity for convening an universal council against Berengarius than against Pelagius; the decisions of the holy See, and of the Councils then held, were unanimously received by the whole Church, and the heresy of Berengarius, quickly crushed, found no longer any sanctuary but with the Manicheans.

136.—*Decision of the great Council of Lateran.—The word Transubstantiation pitched upon, and why.*

It has been seen in what manner these Manicheans began to spread themselves all over the west, filling it with their blasphemies against the Real Presence, and at the same time, with their equivocating language, on purpose to conceal themselves from the Church, whose assemblies they were determined to frequent*. In order, therefore, that she might defeat these equivocations, the Church thought herself obliged to employ some precise terms, as she had done formerly with so much advantage against the Arians and Nestorians, which she did in this manner under Innocent III., in the great council of Lateran in the year of our Lord 1215†. "There is one only universal Church of the faithful out of which there is no salvation, in which Jesus Christ is himself the sacrificer and the victim, whose body and blood are truly contained under the species of bread and wine in the Sacrament of the altar, the bread and wine being transubstantiated, one into the body, and the other into the blood of our Lord by the divine power, to the end that, for accomplishing the mystery of unity, we should take of his what he himself took of ours." There is no one who does not see, that this new word transubstantiation here employed, without adding any thing to the idea of a change of substance which we have seen already owned against Berengarius, did but declare it by an expression, the bare signification of which served for a mark to the faithful against the subtilties and equivocations of heretics, as did heretofore the Homoousion of Nice, and the Theotocos of Ephesus. Such was the decision of the council of Lateran, the greatest and the most numerous that ever had been held, its authority being so great, that posterity has called it, by excellence, the General Council.

---

* S. l. xi. n. 31, 32, &c.

† Conc. Lat. iv. t. xi. Conc. Lab. p. 143.

137.—*The plainness of the Church's Decisions.*

By these decisions may be seen, with what brevity, with what precision, with what uniformity the Church explains herself. Heretics, always in search after their faith, walk groping in the dark, and vary. The Church, which always carries her faith entirely formed in her heart, seeks only to explain it without intricacy and ambiguity; for which reason her decisions are never clogged with a multiplicity of words. Besides, as she beholds without surprise the most sublime difficulties, she proposes them without reserve, convinced that she shall always find in her children a mind ready to captivate itself, and a docility capable of the whole weight of the divine mystery. Heretics, who seek to indulge human sense and the animal part unsusceptible of the divine secret, take great pains to bend the Scripture to their taste and fancy. On the contrary, the Church only thinks of taking it in its plain sense. She hears our Saviour say, "This is my body," and cannot apprehend that what he calls "body" so absolutely, should be anything else than the body itself; wherefore she believes without difficulty, that it is the body in substance, because the body in substance is nothing else but the true and proper body: thus the word substance enters naturally into her expressions. But then Berengarius never thought of using that word; and Calvin, who used it, though agreeing in the main with Berengarius, has thereby made it but manifest, that the figure which Berengarius admitted, did not answer the whole expectation, nor the whole idea of a Christian.

The same simplicity, which made the Church believe the body present in the Sacrament, has made her believe that it was the whole substance of it, Jesus Christ not having said, "My body is here," but "This is it;" and as it is not so by its nature, it becomes, and is made so by the divine power. This is what imports a conversion, a transformation, a change; a word so natural to this mystery, that it could not fail taking place in Berengarius's case, and the more so, as it was everywhere already found in the Liturgies and Fathers.

138.—*Decision of the Council of Trent.*

These reasons, so plain and natural, were opposed to Berengarius. We have no other, even at this day, to oppose against Calvin and Zuinglius: we have received them from Catholics that wrote against Berengarius, as they had received them from those who preceded them; nor has the Council of Trent added anything to the decisions of our forefathers, unless what was necessary for a further elucidation of what Protestants studied to perplex and darken, as will easily be perceived by those who have the least knowledge of the history of our controversies *.

But it was necessary, for instance, to explain more distinctly, that Jesus Christ rendered himself present, not only in the actual use of the Sacrament, as is the Lutherans' opinion †, but immediately after the Consecration, because it is not there said "This shall be," but "This is;" which, nevertheless, was, in the main, what had been formerly said against Berengarius when the presence was annexed, not to the manducation, or to the faith of him who received the Sacrament, but to the "sacred prayer and the word of our Saviour;" whereby also did appear, not the adoration only, but likewise the truth of the oblation and sacrifice, as we have seen confessed by the Protestants: ‡ so that, in the end, there remains no difficulty but in the Real Presence, wherein we have the advantage to discover, that those even who in fact depart from our doctrine, do always endeavour (so sacred is it!) to draw as near to it as they are able.

139.—*Reason for the Council of Constance's Decision touching Communion under one kind.*

The decision of Constance, in approbation of and for retaining communion under one kind, is one of those, wherein our adversaries think they have the most advantage. But in order to be convinced of the gravity and constancy of the

---

* Dur. Troarn. t. xviii. Bib. PP. p. 422. Guit. Ibid. 462, &c.

† S. n. 131. S. l. iii. n. 51, et seq. as far as 56; l. vi. n. 26, 31, et seq.

‡ S. l. ix. n. 26, 27, 28, et seq. as far as n. 75.

Church in this decree, we need but remember that the Council of Constance *, when they passed it, had found the custom of communicating under one kind established, beyond contradiction, many ages before. The case was much the same with that of Baptism by immersion, as clearly grounded on Scripture as communion under both kinds could be, and which, nevertheless, had been changed into infusion, with as much ease and as little contradiction, as communion under one kind was established; so that the same reason stood for retaining one as the other.

140.—*Reasons determining the maintenance of the ancient custom.*

It is a fact most certainly avowed in the Reformation, although at present some will cavil at it, that Baptism was instituted by immersing the whole body into water; that Jesus Christ received it so, and caused it to be so given by his Apostles; that the Scripture knows no other Baptism than this; that antiquity so understood and practised it; that the word itself implies it, to baptize being the same as to dip: this fact, I say, is unanimously acknowledged by all the Divines of the Reformation, nay, by the Reformers themselves, and those even who best understood the Greek language and the ancient customs as well of the Jews as Christians; by Luther, by Melancthon, by Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, by all the rest, and lately even by Jurieu, the most contradicting of all ministers †. Nay, Luther has observed, that the German word signifying Baptism was derived from thence, and this Sacrament named Tauf, from profundity or depth, because the baptized were deeply plunged into water. If, then, any fact in the world can be deemed certain, it is this same: but it is not less certain, even by all these authors, that Baptism without immersion is valid, and that the Church is in the right to retain the custom. It is therefore plain, in a parallel fact, what ought to be our judgment as to the decree of communion under one kind, and that all which is opposed against it, is nothing but chicane.

And, indeed, if there was reason to maintain Baptism without immersion, because, in rejecting it, it would follow, there had been no such thing as Baptism for many ages, consequently, no such thing as a Church, it being impossible for the Church to subsist without the substance of the Sacraments; no less impossible was it, without the substance of the Supper. The same reason, then, subsisted for maintaining communion under one kind, as for maintaining Baptism by infusion; and the Church, in maintaining these two practices which tradition shewed equally indifferent, did nothing else but, according to custom, maintain against contentious spirits that authority, whereon the faith of the people did repose.

---

* Conc. Const. Sess. viii.

† Luth. de Sacr. Bapt. t. i. Mel. loc. com. c. de Baptist. Cal. Inst. iv. 15, 19, &c. Casau. not. in Matt. iii. 6. Grot. Ep. 336. Jur. Syst. l. iii. ch. xx. p. 583.

Whoever desires to see more on this subject, may turn back to those places of this history where it is handled, and among others, to those where may be seen, that communion under one kind was settled with so little contradiction, that it was not impugned by the greatest enemies of the Church, not even by Luther, at the beginning *.

141.—*Question about Justification.*

Next to the question of the Eucharist, the principal one of our controversies is that of justification, in relation to which the gravity of the Church's decisions may be easily understood, in that she did but repeat in the Council of Trent, what the Fathers and St. Austin had decided formerly, when this question was debated with the Pelagians.

142.—*Inherent justice acknowledged on both sides.—Consequence of this Doctrine.*

And, in the first place, it must be supposed there is no question between us, whether or no a sanctity and justice infused into the soul by the Holy Ghost should be acknowledged in man justified ; for the qualities and infused habits are, as above seen, confessed by the Synod of Dort†. The Lutherans are no less steady in defending them ; and, in a word, all Protestants are agreed, that by the regeneration and sanctification of the new man, a sanctity and justice is formed in him like a permanent habit: the question is, whether this sanctity and this justice be what justifies us in the sight of God. But where is the difficulty of this? A sanctity which does not make us saints, a justice which does not make us just, were a subtlety quite unintelligible. But a sanctity and justice formed in us by Almighty God, and yet not pleasing to him; or, if agreeable to him, not making that person in whom it is found agreeable to him, would be another nicety still more unworthy the sincerity of a Christian.

---

* S. l. ii. 10. iii. 60, 61, et seq. vii. 67. xi. 106. xiv. 114, 115. S. n. 43. 61.

† S. l. xiv. n. 43.

143.—*The Church in the Council of Trent does but repeat her ancient Decisions touching the notion of justifying Grace.*

But, after all, when the Church defined in the Council of Trent, that remission of sins was given us, not by a simple imputation of the justice of Jesus Christ outwardly, but by a regeneration which changes and renews us inwardly; she did but repeat what formerly she had defined against the Pelagians in the Council of Carthage, "that children are truly baptized in the remission of sins, to the end that regeneration should purify in them the sin which they contracted by generation *."

Conformably to these principles, the same Council of Carthage † understands by "justifying grace, not only that which remits to us sins committed, but that also which assists us to commit them no more," not only by enlightening our minds, but also by inspiring charity into our hearts, to the end, that "we might fulfil God's commandments." Now, the grace which works these things is not a simple imputation, but is also an emanation of the justice of Jesus Christ: wherefore justifying grace is a different thing from such an imputation; and what was said in the Council of Trent is nothing but a repetition of the Council of Carthage, whose decrees appeared by so much the more inviolable to the Fathers at Trent, as the Fathers of Carthage were sensible, in proposing them, they proposed nothing else on this subject, but what "had always been approved of in the Catholic Church spread over the entire earth ‡."

144.—*Touching gratuity.*

Our forefathers, therefore, did not believe, in order to destroy human glory and attribute all to Jesus Christ, that it was necessary, either to take from man that justice which was in him, or to diminish the value, or deny the effect thereof; but believed they ought to acknowledge it as proceeding from God only by a gratuitous bounty, and this also was what the Trent Fathers acknowledged after them, as above seen in many places of this work §.

It is in this sense that the Catholic Church had always confessed after St. Paul, that "Jesus Christ is made unto us wisdom ||," not by simply imputing to us that wisdom which is in him, but by infusing into our souls that wisdom which flows from his; that he is "unto us justice and sanctity," in the same sense that he is redemption, not by covering our crimes only, but by defacing them entirely by his Holy Spirit poured into our hearts: moreover, that we are "made the justice of God in Jesus Christ*," in a manner more intimate than Jesus Christ "had been made to be sin for us, since God had made him sin," to wit, the victim for sin, by treating him as a sinner though he were just; whereas, he "had made us the justice of God in him," not by leaving us our sins, and merely treating us as just men, but by taking from us our sins, and by rendering us just.

---

* Conc. Carth. cap. i. † Ibid. cap. iii. iv. v. ‡ Ibid. c. iv.
§ S. l. iii. n. 20, et seq. || 1 Cor. i. 29, 30, 31.

145.—*Touching the preparations to Grace, that they all proceed from Grace.*

In order to make this grace inherent in us absolutely gratuitous, our forefathers did not believe that it was necessary to say, one cannot dispose himself for them by good desires, nor obtain them by prayers; but they believed these good desires and prayers were themselves inspired of God; and this is what the Council of Trent† has done after their example, when it said, that all our good dispositions came "from a preventing grace;" that we could not "dispose and prepare ourselves" for grace, but as we are "excited and assisted by grace itself;" that God is the source of all justice, and in this quality ought to be beloved; and that there was "no believing, hoping, loving, nor repenting as we ought, so that the grace of justification might be conferred upon us, without a preventing inspiration of the Holy Ghost‡." Wherein this Holy Council has done no more than repeat what we read in the Council of Orange§, viz. "that we can neither will, nor believe, nor think, nor love as we ought to do, and advantageously, but by the inspiration of preventing grace;" that is to say, they would not dispute either against heretics, or against infidels, or even against heathens, or, in a word, against any others who imagine they love God, and who feel in effect inclinations so like to those of the faithful: but, without entering with them into an impossible discussion of the precise differences of their sentiments from those of the just, they were satisfied with defining, that what is performed without grace, is not "as it ought to be," nor agreeable to God, since "without faith it is impossible to please him||."

---

* 2 Cor. v. 21.

† Sess. vi. c. v. vi.

‡ Can. i.

§ Con. Ara. ii. c. 6, 7, 25.

|| Heb. xi. 6.

146.—*Touching the necessity of preserving Free-will together with Grace.*

If the Council of Trent, in defending the grace of God, hath, at the same time, maintained Free-will, this also was a faithful repetition of our forefathers' sentiments, when they defined, against the Pelagians, "that grace destroyed not free-will, but set it at liberty, to the end that, of darkened it might become full of light; of sick, healthy; of depraved, upright; of imprudent, provident and wise[*]:" for which reason the grace of God was called "an aid and a succour of the free-will;" consequently, something which, far from destroying, conserved and perfected it.

147.—*Touching the merit of good-works.*

According to so pure a notion, far from fearing the word merit, which indeed naturally expressed the dignity of good-works, our Fathers maintained it against the remnant of Pelagians in the same Council of Orange[†], by these words repeated in that of Trent[‡], "the goodness of God is so great to all mankind, that what he gives us, he will even have to be our merit;" from whence it follows, as likewise the same Fathers of the Council of Orange[§] have decided, "that all the works and merits of the saints ought to be referred to God's glory, because none can please him except by the things which he has given."

Lastly, if at Trent they did not fear to acknowledge, with a holy confidence, that eternal recompence is due to good-works, it is still in conformity with, and on the same principles that our Fathers had said in the Council of Orange[||], "that merits do not prevent grace, and that recompence is only due to good-works on account that grace, which was not due, did not precede them."

148.—*Touching the fulfilling of God's commandments.*

By this means we find in the Christian a true justice, but which is given him by God together with his love, and which accordingly makes him accomplish his commandments, wherein the Council of Trent[¶] likewise does not but follow that rule of the Fathers of Orange: viz., "after having received grace by baptism, all the baptized, with the grace and co-operation of

---

[*] Auct. sed. Apost. de grat. inter dec. Cœlest. P P.

[†] Conc. Ara.

[‡] Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. 16.

[§] Conc. Ara. v.

[||] Ibid. c. xviii.

[¶] Conc. Trid. Sess. vi. can. 11. can. 18. cap. xxv.

Jesus Christ, can and ought to fulfil what appertains to salvation, if they will labour faithfully;" where these Fathers have united Jesus Christ's co-operating grace with man's labour and faithful correspondence, agreeably to that saying of St. Paul, "Yet not I, but the grace of God with me*."

149.—*Touching the Truth, and, withal, the imperfection of our Justice.*

Notwithstanding this opinion which we have of Christian justice, yet we do not believe that it is perfect and wholly irreprehensible, since we place the principal part thereof in continually demanding the forgiveness of sins: and if we believe these sins, whereof the most just are obliged daily to implore forgiveness, do not hinder them from being truly just, the Council of Trent has moreover taken this so necessary a decision from the Council of Carthage, which declares† "that the saints are they who say humbly and truly at the same time, 'forgive us our trespasses;' that the Apostle St. James, although holy and just, said, nevertheless, 'we all offend in many things:' that Daniel also, though holy and just, yet did say, 'we have sinned.'" Whence it follows that such sins hinder not holiness and justice, because they hinder not the love of God from reigning in our hearts.

150.—*God accepts our good works for the love of Jesus Christ.*

Now, if the Council of Carthage, on account of these sins, will have us continually say to God, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for that no man living shall be justified in thy sight‡;" we understand this, as does that Council, of perfect justice, without excluding from the just man a true justice; acknowledging, nevertheless, that it is also by an effect of a gratuitous bounty, and for the love of Jesus Christ, that God, who could have set at as high a price as he pleased, to condemned persons as we were, so great a good as life eternal, did not exact of us a righteousness without blemish, and, on the contrary, has consented to judge us, not with extremity of rigour, but with a rigour tempered and suited to our weakness, which obliged the Council of Trent§ to acknowledge "that man hath not wherewith to glorify himself, but all his glory is in Christ Jesus, in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfy, doing worthy fruits of penance which derive from him their virtue; by him are offered to his Father, and for the love of him are accepted by his Father."

---

* 1 Cor. xv. 10. † Cap. vii. viii. ‡ Ibid. § Sess. xiv. c. viii.

151.—*That the Holy Fathers have detested no less than we, as a blasphemy, the doctrine which makes God equally predestinate to good and evil.*

The rock to be feared in celebrating the mystery of Predestination, was the admitting it equally in respect of good and evil; and if the Church abhorred the crime of the pretended Reformers guilty of this excess, she did but walk in the steps of the Council of Orange*, which pronounces an eternal "anathema, with utter detestation, against those who should dare to say that man is predestinated to evil by the divine power;" and of the Council of Valentia†, deciding, in like manner, "that God, by his fore-knowledge, doth impose on no man the necessity of sinning, but foresees only what man would be by his own will; so that the wicked do not perish on account that they had not the power of being good, but because they would not become good, or because they would not remain in the grace they had received."

152.—*The Church always found in the same situation.*

Thus, when a question has been once judged in the Church, as she never fails to decide it according to the tradition of all past ages, so, should it happen to be moved again in succeeding times, you find the Church, after a thousand or twelve hundred years, always in the same situation, always ready to oppose against the enemies of truth the same decrees which the Holy Apostolic See and Catholic Unanimity had pronounced, without ever adding anything thereto, save what is necessary against new errors.

153.—*Our Fathers have rejected, as well as we, the certainty of Salvation and Righteousness.*

To conclude what remains on the subject of justifying grace, I find no decision touching the certainty of salvation, because as yet nothing had obliged the Church to pronounce on this point: yet none has contradicted St. Austin, who teaches "that this certainty is not beneficial in this state of temptation, in which assurance might produce pride*;" which also extends itself, as is plain, to the certainty one might have of present righteousness, so that the Catholic Church, whilst she inspires into her children so great a confidence as to exclude perturbation and trouble, yet leaves in them, after the example of the Apostles, the counterpoise of fear, and no less teaches man to distrust himself than to trust absolutely in God.

---

* Conc. Arau. c. xxv.

† Conc. Valent. iii. c. ii. v.

154.—*Melancthon agrees that the article of Justification is easy to be reconciled.*

In fine, if all that has been seen granted in this work by our adversaries, touching justification and the merits of the saints, be reviewed, it will entirely convince a man that there is not the least occasion to complain of the Church's doctrine†. Melancthon, so zealous for this article, owns nevertheless that "it is easy to come to an agreement on both sides:" what he seems most to insist upon is the certainty of justice; but every humble Christian will easily rest contented with the same certainty with respect to justice as to eternal salvation: all the comfort man ought to have in this life is that of excluding by hope, not only despair, but also trouble and anguish; nor is there anything to reproach a Christian with, who, assured on God's side, has no longer anything to fear or doubt but from himself.

155.—*The clearness of the Church's decisions.—She cuts away the root of abuses in regard of Prayer to the Saints.*

The decisions of the Catholic Church are not less clear and precise than they are firm and lasting, always obviating whatever might give occasion to the mind of man going astray‡. Honouring the Saints in her assemblies, was honouring God, the author of their sanctity and bliss; and demanding of them the partnership of their prayers, was joining ourselves to the choirs of angels, to the spirits of the perfectly just, and to the Church of the first-born which are in heaven. So holy a practice may be discovered ever since the first ages, nor is the beginning of it to be discovered there, since none can then be found who were noted for innovation in that regard. The thing most to be feared with respect to the ignorant was, lest they should make the invocation of saints too like to that of God, and their intercession too like that of Jesus Christ: but the Council of Trent* instructs us fully as to these two points, by warning us that the saints pray,—which places them at an infinite distance from him who gives; and that they pray through Jesus Christ,—which places them infinitely beneath him who is heard through himself.

---

* De correct. et grat. c. xiii. de Civ. Dei. xi. 12.

† S. l. iii. n. 25, et seq., viii. 22, et seq. Sent. Phil. Mel. de pace Ec. p. 10. Bern. Ser. i. de Sept.

‡ S. l. xiii. xiv.

156.—*Regarding Images.*

Setting up images is rendering sensible the mysteries and examples which sanctify us. The thing to be feared in respect of the ignorant is, lest they should believe that the divine nature might be represented, or rendered present in images, or, at all events, lest they should look upon them as filled with some virtue for which they are honoured; these are the three characters of idolatry. But the Council has rejected them in plain terms†; so that it is not lawful to attribute to one image more virtue than to another, nor, by consequence, to frequent one more than another, unless in memory of some miracles, or some pious history which might excite devotion.‡ The use of images being thus purified, Luther himself and the Lutherans will demonstrate that images of this kind are not what the Decalogue speaks of, and the honour rendered to them will be manifestly nothing else than a sensible and exterior testimony of the pious remembrance they excite, and the simple and natural effect of that mute language which accompanies these pious representations, and whose usefulness is so much the greater, as it is capable of being understood by all mankind.

157.—*Regarding Worship in general.*

In general, worship is referred to the interior and exterior exercise of faith, of hope, and of charity, and principally to that of this last virtue, whose property it is to unite us with God; so that a worship in spirit and in truth exists everywhere, wherever there is to be found the exercise of charity towards God or towards our neighbour, conformably to that saying of St. James, "Pure religion, and undefiled before God is this, to visit the fatherless and widows, and to keep himself unspotted from the world*;" and every act of piety not animated with this spirit is imperfect, carnal, or superstitious.

---

* Sess. xxv. decr. de invoc. S. S. † Ibid. ‡ S. l. ii. n. 28. § Jas. i. 27.

158.—*Against those who accuse the Council of Trent of having spoken ambiguously.*

Under pretext that the Council of Trent declined entering into many difficulties, our adversaries, after Fra-Paolo, are continually blaming it as having explained the dogmata in general, obscure, and equivocal terms, with the design of pleasing in appearance the greatest number: but they would entertain more equitable sentiments, did they but consider, that God, who knows how far he designs to guide our understanding in revealing to us some truth, or some mystery, does not always reveal to us either the ways of explaining it, or the circumstances which accompany it, or even wherein it consists as to its utmost precision, or, as we speak in schools, as to its specific difference; so that, in Church decisions, it is often necessary to keep to general expressions, in order to retain that measure of faith so much commended by St. Paul [*], and not to transgress his precept forbidding us to be more wise than we ought to be.

159.—*The principles of Protestants prove the necessity of Purgatory.*

For example, in the controversy concerning Purgatory, the Council of Trent has firmly believed as a truth revealed of God, that just souls may depart this life without being wholly purified. Grotius proves evidently [†], that this truth is confessed by Protestants, by Mestresat, by Spanheim, by Calvin himself, on this common ground-work of the Reformation, viz. that in the whole course of this life the soul is never entirely pure, whence it follows that she is still defiled at her departure from the body. But the Holy Ghost hath pronounced, that " not anything that is polluted shall enter into the holy city [‡];" and the minister Spanheim [§] proves unanswerably, that the soul cannot be presented to God till she be " without spot or wrinkle, all holy, pure, unblameable," conformably to the doctrine of St. Paul [||], which he allows she cannot be, during this mortal life.

160.—*Protestants do not reject the purification of souls after this life.*

After this still remains the question, whether or no this purification of the soul be wrought in this life at the last moment, or after death; and Spanheim leaves the thing undecided *: "The main point (says he) is uncertain, but the manner and circumstances are not so." But without further pressing this author with the principles of the sect, the Catholic Church advances beyond this: for the tradition of all ages having taught her to pray in behalf of the dead, for the comfort of their souls, for the forgiveness of their sins, and their relief, she has held it for a certain truth, that the perfect purification of souls was performed after death, and this by secret pains not alike explained by the holy doctors, but of which they said only, that they might be mitigated and wholly remitted by prayers and oblations, answerably to the Liturgies of all Churches.

---

[*] Rom. xii. 3. [†] Grot. Ep. extraor. pp. 575, 578, 579. [‡] Rev. xxi. 27.
[§] Span. dub. Ev. Tem. iii. dub. 141. n. vi. vii. [||] Ephes. v. 27.

161.—*Moderation of the Church in not determining anything but what is certain.*

Without examining in this place whether this sentiment be good or bad, it were no longer equitable, or candid, to refuse granting us, that in this presupposition at least, the Council ought to have formed its decree in a general expression, and defined as it has done: † first, that there is a Purgatory after this life; secondly, that the prayers of the living may afford relief to faithful souls departed, without descending to particulars, either of their pains or the manner in which they are purified, because tradition did not explain it; but shewing only that they are purified by Jesus Christ alone, they being purified only by prayers and oblations made in his name.

162.—*The difference of general terms, from indefinite, perplexed, or ambiguous terms.*

The same judgment ought to be passed on other decisions, and care taken not to confound, as our reformed here do, general with indefinite, intricate, or ambiguous terms. Indefinite terms signify just nothing; ambiguous terms signify equivocally, and leave in the mind no determinate sense; intricate terms raise a mist of confused ideas; but although general terms carry not the evidence as far as the utmost precision, they are, however, to a certain degree perspicuous.

163.—*General terms are clear in their way.*

Our adversaries will not deny that the passages of Scripture, which say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the

---

* N. vii.

† Sess. xxv. dec. de Purg.

Father, denote clearly some truth, since they denote, beyond all doubt, that the third Person of the Trinity derives his origin from the Father no less than the second, although they do not express specifically wherein his profession consists, nor wherein it is different from that of the Son. It is, therefore, plain, that general expressions cannot be blamed, without blaming at the same time Jesus Christ and the Gospel.

164.—*In what consists the clearness of a decision.*

It is in this that our adversaries always shew themselves unjust to the Council, sometimes blaming it for descending too much to particulars, and sometimes requiring it should have decided all the disputes of the Scotists and Thomists, under penalty of being convicted of affected obscurity: as if they were ignorant that, in decisions of faith, a free scope ought to be allowed to divines for proposing different means of explaining the Christian truths, and, consequently, that a Council, waiving their several and particular opinions, ought to keep itself within the compass of such essential points, as they all defend in common. This method of defining the articles of our faith is so far from speaking equivocally, that, on the contrary, it is an effect of clearness to define so plainly that which is certain, as not to involve in the decision what is doubtful; nor is there anything more becoming the authority and majesty of a Council, than to repress the impetuosity of those who would advance beyond these bounds.

165.—*That which is certain in regard of the Pope's authority, acknowledged in the Council and by the Catholic Doctors.*

Conformably to this rule, a form for explaining the Pope's authority having been proposed at Trent in such terms as that his superiority over the general Council might in some manner be inferred, the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Bishops of France being opposed to it, Cardinal Pallavicini himself relates in his history, that the form was suppressed, and the Pope answered, that "Nothing ought to be defined but what all the Fathers should unanimously agree to *;" an admirable rule in order to separate what is certain from what is doubtful! Whence it also came to pass that the Cardinal du Perron, although a zealous defender of the interests of the Court of Rome, declared to the King of England, "That the dispute concerning the Pope's authority, whether in its spiritual regard to Œcumenical Councils, or in its temporal regard to secular jurisdictions, is not a dispute about things that are held for articles of faith, or are inserted and required in the Confession of Faith, or that could hinder his Majesty from entering into the Church, should he be satisfied in other points [*]." And even in our days, the renowned Andrew du Val [†], doctor of Sorbonne, to whom those on the other side of the Alps referred the defence of their cause, decided that the doctrine denying the Pope's infallibility is not absolutely against faith; and that which places the Council above the Pope cannot be branded with any censure, either of heresy, or error, or even of temerity.

---

* Hist. Conc. Trid. interp. Giattin. lib. xix. c. xi, xiii, xiv. xv.

166.—*With this moderation, Melancthon would have owned the Pope's authority.*

Thereby it appears that doctrines, not supported by a certain and perpetual tradition, cannot strike root in the Church, since they make not a part of her confession of faith; and that even those who teach them, teach them as their particular doctrine, and not as the doctrine of the Catholic Church [‡]. To reject the supremacy and authority of the Holy See, with this wholesome moderation, is to reject the band of Christians, is to be at enmity with order and peace, and to envy the Church that good which Melancthon himself wished it might enjoy [§].

167.—*Abridgment of this last book, and first, touching the perpetual Visibility of the Church.*

After what has been seen, there is nothing left at present that can hinder our reformed from submitting to the Church; the shelter of a Church invisible is abandoned: no longer is it allowable to allege in its defence the obscurities of the Jewish Church; the ministers have freed us from the trouble of answering on that head, by shewing clearly, that the true worship was never interrupted, not even under Achaz and Manasses [||]: the Christian society, more extensive than that of the Jews, according to the conditions of its covenant, has likewise stood more firm, and the perpetual visibility of the Catholic Church can be no longer doubted of.

---

[*] Reply, l. vi. Præf. p. 858.

[†] Du Vall. Elench. p. 9. it. tract. de Sup. Rom. Pont. potes. part ii. q. 1. p. 4. q. 7, 8.

[‡] Vid. l. iv. 39. v. 24, 25.

[§] Mel. de pace, c. de pot. Pontif. p. 6.

[||] 4 Reg. xvi. 4, 15. xxi. Jur. Syst. pp. 222, 223.

168.—*A remark on the Confession of Augsburg.*

Those of the Confession of Augsburg are yet more obliged to acknowledge it than the Calvinists *: the Invisible Church has neither found place in their Confession of Faith, nor in their apology, wherein, on the contrary, we have seen the Church spoken of in the Creed vested with a perpetual visibility, and, according to these principles, they should be able to shew us an assembly made up of pastors and people, in which sound doctrine and the Sacraments have ever flourished.

169.—*The arguments brought by them against the authority of the Church, are resolved by the Ministers.*

All the arguments that were formed against the authority of the Church are given up. Yielding to the authority of the Universal Church, is now no longer acting unadvisedly nor submitting to men, since they own that her sentiments are the rule, nay, the most sure rule, for deciding the most important truths of religion †. They agree, if this rule had been followed, and men had proposed to themselves the understanding holy Scripture as it was understood by the Universal Church, that there never would have been Socinians; never should we have heard the divinity of Jesus Christ called in question, the immortality of the soul, the eternity of pains, the creation, God's foreknowledge, the spirituality of his essence: things so firmly believed among Christians, that they did not so much as think they could be ever doubted of, and which at present are impugned with such captious arguments, that very many weak minds are ensnared thereby. They agree that the authority of the Universal Church is an infallible remedy against this disorder; so that the authority of the Church, far from being, what was said in the Reformation, a means of introducing all manner of new-fangled doctrines amongst Christians, is, on the contrary, a certain means of putting a stop to the licentiousness of men's minds, of preventing the abuse they make of the sublimity of Scripture, after a manner so dangerous to the salvation of souls.

The Reformation has discovered these truths at last; and if the Lutherans will not receive them from the hands of a Calvinian minister, they have but to explain to us how they can resist the authority of the Church after having owned that the truth is always manifest in her*.

---

* S. n. 4. et seq. to n. 10.

† S. n. 86, 87, et seq.

170.—*Salvation to be had in the Church of Rome.*

None now, of whatever separate communions, should any longer hesitate to come and seek eternal life in the bosom of the Church of Rome, since it is confessed † that God's true people and his true elect are still in her, as it hath always been confessed that they were before the pretended Reformation. But it is perceived at length, that the difference put between the ages that preceded, and those which followed it, was vain, and that the difficulty which was made of acknowledging this truth, proceeded from evil policy.

Should the Lutherans here start new difficulties, and not suffer themselves to be persuaded by the sentiments of Calixtus, let them shew us what the Church of Rome has done since Luther's time to forfeit the title of a true Church, and so to lose her fecundity, that the elect can be no longer born in her womb.

171.—*The Ministers are not to be believed when they make Salvation so difficult in the Church of Rome.*

True it is, when the ministers acknowledge you may be saved in the Church of Rome, they would make you believe you may do it as in an infected air, and by a kind of miracle, by reason of her impieties and idolatries. But men should learn to distinguish, in the ministers, what hatred has made them add, from what truth has forced them to confess. If the Church of Rome made profession of impiety and idolatry, no salvation could have been had in her, either before or after the Reformation; and if, both before and after, salvation may be had in her body, the accusation of impiety and idolatry is unworthy and calumnious.

172.—*Excesses of the Ministers who prefer the Arian Sect to the Church of Rome.*

And, indeed, the hatred they shew to her is but too visible, since they are so far transported as to say, that without doubt a man may save his soul in that communion, but with greater difficulty than "amongst the Arians‡," who deny the divinity of the Son of God and of the Holy Ghost; who, by consequence, believe themselves devoted to creatures by baptism; who, in the Eucharist, look on the flesh of a man, who is not God, as the source of life; who believe that, without being God, a man has saved them, and was able to pay the price of their redemption; who invoke him as the person to whom all power is given in heaven and on earth; who are consecrated to the Holy Ghost, namely, to a creature, to become his temples; who believe that a creature, to wit, the same Holy Ghost, distributes grace to them as he pleases, regenerates them, and sanctifies them by his presence. This is the sect they prefer to the Church of Rome; and is not this saying to all that are capable of understanding, Believe not one word we say; when we speak of that Church, hatred possesses and sets us besides ourselves.

---

* S. n. 4. et seq.

† S. n. 50, 51. et seq. as far as n. 59.

‡ Prej. leg. part i. ch. i. Syst. p. 225.

173.—*The Protestants can no longer excuse themselves from Schism.*

Lastly, there is no longer any possibility for our reformed to avoid being reckoned amongst the number of those "who separate themselves, and who make a sect apart," contrary to the precept of the Apostles, particularly St. Jude *, and contrary to the import of their own Catechism †. Here are its very words in the exposition of the Creed: "The article of forgiveness of sins is placed after that of the Catholic Church, because no one obtains pardon for his sins except beforehand he be incorporated with God's people, and persevere in unity and communion with the body of Christ, and so be a member of the Church; insomuch that, out of the Church, there is nothing but death and damnation; for all those who separate from the society of the faithful, *to make a sect apart*, ought not to hope for salvation whilst they are in division."

The article speaks clearly of the Universal Church, visible and always visible, and in this we have seen that they are agreed ‡: they are agreed likewise, as to a fact certain and notorious, that the Churches, which call themselves reformed, at their renouncing the communion of the Church of Rome, did not find on earth one Church which they united with: they therefore made a sect apart from the whole body of Christians and Universal Church; and, according to their own doctrine, renounce the grace of forgiveness of sins, which is the fruit of the blood of Jesus Christ; and death and damnation is their lot.

---

* Jud. xvii. 18.

† Dim. xvi.

‡ S. n. 21, 22, 34, 35, et seq. 68, 81, 82, 83.

174.—*Short repetition of the absurdities of the new System.*

The absurdities, necessarily attending the answer to this argument, plainly discover how invincible it is; for after a thousand fruitless shifts, they were, in fine, driven into such straits as even to say*, that you remain in the Catholic and Universal Church, in renouncing the communion of all Churches in the world, and in making a Church apart; that you remain in the same Universal Church although driven from it by a just censure; that you cannot go forth from it by any other crime than that of apostacy, by renouncing Christianity and your baptism; that all the Christian sects, how divided soever they be, are one and the same body, and one and the same Church in Jesus Christ: that Christian Churches have no exterior band of union by the appointment of Jesus Christ; that their band is arbitrary; that the Confessions of Faith whereby they unite themselves, are arbitrary likewise, and contracts susceptible of what terms you please, which yet may not be broken without incurring the guilt of Schism; that the union of Churches depends on empires and the will of princes; that all Christian Churches are naturally, and by their origin, independent one of another, whence it follows that the Independents, so grievously censured at Charenton, do nothing else but stand up for the natural liberty of Churches; that, provided you find means of assembling together either with consent or by violence so as "to make a figure in the world," you are a true member of the body of the Catholic Church; that no heresy ever has, or can be, condemned by a judgment of the Universal Church; nay, that there is not, nor can be, any ecclesiastical judgment in matters of faith; that men have no right to exact subscriptions to the decrees of Synods respecting faith; that one may save his soul in the most perverse sects, even in that of the Socinians.

175.—*The height of absurdities, viz. the kingdom of Jesus Christ confounded with the kingdom of Satan.*

There would be no end were I to repeat all the absurdities it was necessary to vent in order to save the Reformation from the sentence pronounced against those "who make a sect apart." But, besides that it is needless to enter into a detail of them, they are all comprised in this one which has been always more or less maintained in the Reformation, and wherein the whole defence of the cause is placed now more than ever; viz. "that the Catholic Church," whereof the Creed speaks, is one heap of sects divided amongst one another, and which anathematize one another *; insomuch that the character of Jesus Christ's kingdom is the same with that given by Jesus Christ to the kingdom of Satan, as above explained.

---

* S. n. 65, &c.

But nothing is more opposite to the doctrine of Christ himself. According to his doctrine, the kingdom of Satan is divided against itself †, and must fall, house upon house, to utter desolation. On the contrary, according to the promise of Jesus Christ, his Church, which is his kingdom built on the rock ‡, on the same Confession of Faith, and the same ecclesiastical government, is perfectly united: whence it follows that she is immovable, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; that is to say, division, the cause of weakness and the character of hell, shall not get the better of unity, the cause of strength, and the character of the Church. But all this order is changed in the Reformation; and the kingdom of Jesus Christ being divided like to that of Satan, no wonder men have said, conformably to such a principle, that it was fallen to ruin and desolation.

176.—*The immovable steadfastness of the Church.—Conclusion of this Work.*

These maxims of division were the ground-work of the Reformation, inasmuch as it was established by an universal rupture, and a Church-unity has never been known therein: and therefore its Variations, whose history we have at length concluded, have shewed us what it was, to wit, a kingdom disunited, divided against itself, and which must fall sooner or later: whilst the Catholic Church, so unalterably attached to decrees once pronounced, that not the least variation since the origin of Christianity can be discovered in her, shews herself a Church built on the rock, always in full security from the promises she has received, firm in her principles, and guided by a Spirit which never contradicts himself.

May He who holds in his hand the hearts of men, and who alone knows the bounds he has set to rebellious sects, and to the afflictions of his Church, cause all his stray children quickly to return to her unity; and may we have the joy to behold with our eyes Israel, so unfortunately divided, unite under one and the same head with Judah §.

---

* S. n. 51, &c. † Luke xi. ‡ Matt. xvi. § Hosea i. 11.

A MATERIAL

APPENDIX

TO

THE FOURTEENTH BOOK.

1.—*A new Book writ by the Minister Jurieu concerning the union of the Calvinists with the Lutherans.*

After this impression was finished, a Latin book fell into my hands, which the indefatigable Jurieu has just brought to light, and whereof it is requisite I should give the public some account. The title is, "An Amicable Consultation concerning Peace between the Protestants." Therein he treats of this subject with the Doctor Daniel Severin Scultet, who, on his side, proposes to himself to smooth the difficulties of this peace so frequently attempted and so unsuccessfully. The question chiefly in debate is that of predestination and grace. The Lutheran cannot digest what was defined at the Synod of Dort touching absolute decrees and grace irresistible: he judges still more insupportable what the same Synod teaches of the inamissibility of justice, and the certainty of salvation, there being nothing, in his notion, more impious than to give to man once justified, a certain assurance in the midst of the most heinous crimes, that they shall neither make him forfeit his salvation in eternity, nor in time even the Holy Ghost and the grace of adoption. I repeat not the explanation of these questions, which the reader must have understood from the account given of them in this history *; but shall only say, that this is what is called, among the Lutherans, the *particularism* of the Calvinists: so abominable a heresy that they charge it with nothing less than of making God the author of sin, and of subverting all Christian morality, by inspiring with a pernicious security those who are abandoned

* L. ix. xiv.

to the most abominable enormities. Mr. Jurieu does not deny that the Synod of Dort taught these dogmata laid to its charge: he endeavours only to clear them from those evil consequences which are thence drawn; and he himself carries so far the certainty of salvation, the very dogma we have seen all centre in, as to say, that taking it from the faithful is making a Christian's life an insufferable torment*. He grants then, in the main, the sentiments imputed to the Calvinists: but, in order to bring about a peace, notwithstanding so great an opposition in such important articles, after proposing some mitigations consisting in words only, he concludes for a mutual toleration. The reasons he grounds himself on are reduced to two, one whereof is recrimination, and the other a compensation of dogmata.

2.—*The Minister Jurieu's recriminations against the Lutherans, concerning Luther's blasphemies.*

As for recrimination, Mr. Jurieu's reasoning is as follows. You accuse us, says he to Doctor Scultet, of making God the author of sin †; it is Luther you must accuse of this, not us: and thereupon cites to him those passages we have above related, where Luther decides "that God's prescience renders free-will impossible; that Judas, for this reason, could not help betraying his master; that all that passes in man, whether good or evil, happens by pure and inevitable necessity; that it is God who operates in man all the good and evil that is done by him, and makes man guilty of damnation by necessity; that David's adultery is no less the work of God than the vocation of St. Paul; lastly, that it is no more unworthy of God to damn the innocent, than to forgive, as he does, the guilty."

The Calvinist then shews, that Luther does not speak here in a doubting manner, but with that terrible decision above specified, and which suffers no reply on this head: "You (says he ‡) that hear me, never forget that I am the man who thus teaches, and without any new inquiry submit to this word."

The Lutheran thought to escape, by saying that Luther had recanted: but the Calvinist nonplusses him when he demands §, "where is this recantation of Luther? It is true, (proceeds he,) he has begged we would excuse, in his first books, some remnants of Popery in regard to indulgences: but as to what regards Free-will, he never changed a tittle of his doctrine." And, indeed, it is very certain that the above-said monsters of impiety were far from being derived from Popery, which, as Luther acknowledges in all these places, held them in execration.

---

* P. i. c. viii. p. 2, c. vi. p. 191, &c. xi. 253, 254.

† S. l. ii. n. 17. Jur. part ii. c. viii. p. 210, et seq.

‡ S. l. ii. n. 17

§ Jur. Ibid. pp. 217, 218.

Mr. Jurieu, in that respect, is of the same opinion with us, and declares*, "he holds in abhorrence these dogmata of Luther, as impious, horrible, frightful, deserving every anathema, introductive of Manicheism, and subversive of all religion." He is sorry to see himself obliged to speak thus of the head of the Reformation. "I speak it (says he) with grief, and favour, as much as I am able, the memory of this great man." This is, therefore, one of those confessions, which the evidence of truth extorts from men, how much soever against their will; and, in fine, the author of the Reformation, by the very confession of the Reformed, is convicted of being an impious blasphemer against God: after this, a great man, as much as they please; for to have sounded the alarm against Rome, is merit enough in the Reformation for any titles whatever. Melancthon is guilty of this wicked doctrine, which destroys all religion. Mr. Jurieu has convicted him of uttering the same blasphemies as his master†; and instead of detesting them, as they deserved, of never having retracted them but too faintly and with diffidence. You see on what corner-stones the Reformation was built.

3.—*Whether Calvin has less blasphemed than Luther.*

But because Mr. Jurieu here seems willing to excuse Calvin, he need but cast his eyes on the passages of this author already quoted by me in this history: there will he find‡ "that Adam could not avoid his fall, and was nevertheless guilty, because he fell voluntarily; that it was ordained by God, and comprised in his secret decrees." There will he find, "that a hidden counsel of God is the cause of hardness of heart; that we must not deny that God willed and decreed the defection of Adam, since he does all he wills; that this decree, he must confess, raises horror; yet, after all, it cannot be denied but God foresaw the fall of man, because he had ordained it by his own decree; that we ought not to use the word permission, since it is an express order; that the will of God makes the necessity of things; and all he hath willed happens necessarily; that it was for this reason Adam fell by an order of God's providence, and because God had so judged it fitting, although he fell through his own fault; that the reprobate are inexcusable, although they cannot shun the necessity of sinning; and that this necessity befalls them by God's appointment*; that God speaks to them, but on purpose to make them the more deaf; that he places light before their eyes, but on purpose to blind them; that he applies sound doctrine to them, but on purpose to render them the more insensible; that he sends them remedies, but to the end they may not be cured."

---

* Jur. part ii. c. viii. pp. 211, 214, et seq.

† Ibid. p. 24.

‡ S. l. xiv. n. 4. Opusc. de præd. pp. 704, 705. Inst. iii. xxiii. i. pp. 1, 7, 8, 9.

What is here wanting to make Calvin as complete a Manichean as Luther†.

What, therefore, does it avail Mr. Jurieu to have quoted us some passages of Calvin, where he seems to say that man was free in Adam, and fell in Adam by his own will; since it is otherwise certain from Calvin himself, that this will of Adam was the necessary effect of a special decree of God? And, indeed, the truth is, this minister has not pretended absolutely to excuse his Calvin, but contents himself with saying only, "he was sober in comparison to Luther‡:" but we have just heard him speak not less extravagantly and impiously than Luther.

I have also produced Beza's words§, which manifestly refer all sins to the will of God as their first cause. Thus, beyond all dispute, the heads of both parties of the Reformation, Luther and Melancthon on one side, Calvin and Beza on the other, the masters and disciples, equally are convicted of Manicheism and impiety; and Mr. Jurieu has had reason to confess candidly of the Reformers in general, that they taught that "God drove on wicked men to enormous crimes||."

4.—*Another recrimination of the Minister Jurieu.—The Lutherans convicted of Pelagianism.*

The Calvinist returns to the charge, and here is another recrimination not less remarkable. You upbraid us, says he to the Lutherans, with our irresistible grace: but in order to make it resistible you run to the opposite extreme; and, unlike to your master Luther, whereas in matter of grace, he so far outwent all bounds "as to make himself suspected of Manicheism," you do the like in Free-will, so as to turn Demi-

---

* S. l. xxiv. n. 13.
† Jur. part ii. c. xiii. ibid. p. 214.
‡ Ibid.
§ S. l. xiv. n. 2, 3.
|| Ibid. n. 4.

Pelagians, since you attribute to it the beginning of salvation*. Which he makes evident by the same proofs we have made use of in this history, by shewing the Lutherans that, according to them, the grace of conversion depends on the care they themselves take to hear the word preached. I have clearly demonstrated this Demi-Pelagianism of the Lutherans from the book of Concord, and from other testimonies: but the minister strengthens my proofs with the testimony of his adversary, Scultet, who confesses in as many words†, "that God converts men, when men themselves receive the word preached with respect and attention." Accordingly, it is in this manner the Lutherans explain the universal will of saving all mankind, and say with Scultet, "that God will infuse contrition and a lively faith into the hearts of all the adult, provided, nevertheless, they do *beforehand* the necessary duty for man's conversion." Thus, what they attribute to the divine power, is that grace which goes hand in hand with preaching; and what they attribute to Free-will, is rendering itself beforehand, by its own strength, attentive to the word announced: which is saying, as clearly as ever the Demi-Pelagians have done, that the beginning of salvation comes purely from the Free-will; and, that there may be no doubt that this is the error of the Lutherans, Mr. Jurieu produces moreover a passage from Calixtus, where he transcribes word for word the propositions condemned in the Demi-Pelagians; for he says, in express terms‡, "that there remains in all men some strength of the understanding, of the will, and of natural knowledge," which, if they make right "use of, in labouring what they are able for their salvation, God will afford them the necessary means to arrive at the perfection which revelation leads us to;" which once more makes grace depend on what man precedently does by his own strength.

I was right, then, in affirming that the Lutherans are become true Demi-Pelagians, namely, Pelagians in the most dangerous part of this heresy, it being that by which human pride is the most flattered. For the greatest mischief of Pelagianism is placing man's salvation finally in his own hands, independently of grace. Now this it is they do, who, like the Lutherans, make the conversion and justification of a sinner dependent on a beginning introductive of all the rest, and which, nevertheless, the sinner gives to himself merely by his Free-will without grace, as I have proved evidently, and as Mr. Jurieu has also but just made apparent from the Confession of the Lutherans.

---

* Jur. part ii. c. viii. p. 117. S. l. viii. n. 83, et seq. xiv. 116.

† Jur. p. 117.

‡ Jur. p. 118. Calix. Ep.

They ought not, therefore, to flatter themselves, as if they had escaped the Anathema merited by the Pelagians, under pretext that they are only such by halves; since we see that this part swallowed by them of so mortal a poison, as that of Pelagianism, contains its own malignity: from whence one may perceive the deplorable condition of the whole Protestant party; since, on one side, the Calvinists know no way of maintaining Christian grace against the Pelagians, but by making it inamissible with all the other aforesaid inconveniences; and on the other, the Lutherans believe there is no avoiding this detestable particularism of Dort and of the Calvinists, but by turning Pelagians, and abandoning man's salvation to his own Free-will.

5.—*Sequel of Recriminations.—The Lutherans convicted of denying the necessity of good works.*

The Calvinist pursues his point; and, says he to the Lutherans, "it is impossible to dissemble" your doctrine against the necessity of good works. "I will not (proceeds he) go in quest of the harsh propositions of your Doctors, ancient and modern, on this subject*." As I take it, he glances at the Decree of Worms, where we have observed that it was decided that good works are not necessary to salvation. But without insisting on this assembly, and other the like decrees of the Lutherans, I shall observe only (says he to Scultet) what you yourself have taught†: "That it is not lawful for us to give any alms to the poor, no, not a farthing, with the design of obtaining forgiveness of our sins." And, again, "That the habit and exercise of virtue is not absolutely necessary for the justified in order to be saved: that the exercise of the love of God, neither in the course of life, nor even at the hour of death, is a necessary condition, without which we cannot be saved." Lastly, "That neither the habit nor exercise of virtue is necessary to a dying person, in order to obtain forgiveness of his sins;" that is to say, "a man is saved (as this Minister concludes) without having done so much as one good work, either in his life or at his death."

---

* Jur. part ii. c. ii. p. 243.

† S. l. iii. n. 12. viii. n. 32. pp. 243, 244.

6.—*Another recrimination on the certainty of Salvation.—The Lutherans convicted of contradiction and blindness.*

These are just and terrible recriminations, of which Dr. Scultet will never clear himself: again, here is another no less remarkable. You object to us as a crime (says Mr. Jurieu* to him), the certainty of salvation defined in the Synod of Dort; but you, who object it to us, hold the same yourselves. Thereupon he produces the Theses, wherein Doctor John Gerard (the third man after Luther and Chemnicius of the Reformation, if we believe their testimony who approved his works) advances this proposition†. "We maintain against the Papists the certainty of salvation as a certainty of faith." And, again, "The predestinate has in himself God's testimony, and says interiorly to himself, 'he that predestinated me from all eternity, calls me, and justifies me in time by his word.'" It is certain he wrote these things, and others every whit as strong, alleged by Mr. Jurieu‡: they are usual with the Lutherans. But this Minister reproaches them, with reason, that they are not consistent with their doctrine of the amissibility of justice, which they account as a capital point; accordingly, it is what I have remarked in this history, nor have I forgotten the solution proposed by the Lutherans, and even by Dr. Gerard: but I warrant not the contradictions the Minister Jurieu upbraids them with in these words §:—"It is a thing incredible that wise men, having eyes in their heads, should have fallen into so stupendous a blindness, as to believe one is assured of his salvation with a certainty of faith, and, at the same time, that the true believer may lose the faith and eternal salvation." From thence he takes occasion to reproach them, that their doctrine is self-contradictory, that their universalism, introduced contrary to Luther's principles, has brought such a confusion into their theology, "that there is none but is sensible that it has no longer any manner of coherence; that it cannot be self-consistent; that they have no excuse left them ||." Thus you see how these men treat one another when in peace; what do not they do when at mortal war?

---

* Jur. part i. c. viii. pp. 128, 129.

† Gerard. de elect. et rep. c. xiii. Thes. pp. 210, 211.

‡ Jur. part i. c. viii. p. 129. Sup. l. iii. n. 39. viii. n. 60, 61.

§ Ibid.

|| Ibid. pp. 213, 129, 131, 135.

7.—*Another recrimination.—The monster of Ubiquity.*

Besides what regards grace, the Minister also charges the Lutherans very home with their monstrous doctrine of Ubiquity, "worthy (says he*) of all the eulogiums you bestow on the decisions of Dort, a frightful, huge, and horrid monster, of a prodigious deformity in itself, and still more prodigious in its consequences; since it brings back the confusion of natures in Jesus Christ, and not only that of the soul with the body, but also that of the divinity with the humanity, and, in a word, Eutychianism, so unanimously detested by the whole Church."

He shews them they have added to the Confession of Augsburg this monster of Ubiquity, and to Luther's doctrine their excessive Universalism, which has made them fall back into the error of the Pelagians. All these reproaches are very true, as we have made appear†; and here you behold the Lutherans, the first of those that took up the title of Reformers, convicted by the Calvinists of being all at once Pelagians in formal terms, and Eutychians by consequences indeed‡, but such as the whole world is sensible of, and which are as clear as the noon-day.

8.—*The compensation of Dogmata proposed to the Lutherans by the Minister Jurieu.*

After all these vigorous recriminations, one would think that the Minister Jurieu§ must conclude to detest, in the Lutherans, so many abominable excesses, so many visible contradictions, so manifest a blindness: no such thing. He accuses the Lutherans of so many enormous errors, only to conclude a peace by a mutual toleration on both sides, notwithstanding the gross errors both stand convicted of by the testimonies of each other.

Here, then, he proposes that marvellous compensation, that bartering of doctrine, where all terminates in concluding "if our particularism be an error, we offer you a toleration for much more strange errors." Let us strike up peace on this foundation, and mutually declare one another God's faithful servants, without any obligation on either side of correcting anything in our tenets. We allow you all the prodigies of your doctrine||: we allow you that monstrous

---

* Jur. part i. c. viii. 242. † S. l. viii. n. 46. ‡ Jur. ibid.
§ Jur. part ii. c. iii. et seq. x, xi. p. 240. || Part i. c. viii. p. 123.

Ubiquity: we allow you your Demi-Pelagianism, which places the beginning of man's salvation purely in his own hands: we allow you that horrid dogma*, which denies that good works and the habit of charity, any more than the exercise thereof, are necessary to salvation, either in life or at death: we tolerate you, we receive you to the holy table, we own you for God's children, notwithstanding all these errors: overlook, then, in our behalf, and in behalf of the Synod of Dort, these absolute decrees with grace irresistible, the certainty of salvation with the inamissibility of justice, together with all the rest of our particular dogmata, how much soever you abhor them.

This is the bargain he proposes; this what he negotiates in the face of the whole Christian world: a peace between Churches calling themselves not only Christian, but also Reformed; not by agreeing in the doctrine which they believe expressly revealed by God, but by forgiving mutually each other the most unpardonable errors.

What shall be the issue of this treaty? I am loth to foresee it: but will be bold to say the Calvinists shall gain nothing else by it but an addition to their own errors of those of the Lutherans, which they make themselves accomplices in by admitting to the holy table those as the true children of God who professedly maintain them. As for the Lutherans, if it be true, as it is insinuated by Mr. Jurieu†, that they begin for the most part to become more tractable in regard to the Real Presence, and offer peace to the Calvinists, provided only they receive their Demi-Pelagian Universalism, the whole universe will be witness that they have made a peace by sacrificing to the Sacramentarians what Luther did most defend against them, even to his death, to wit, the reality; and by making them profess what the same Luther most detested, namely, Pelagianism, to which he preferred the opposite extreme, even the horror of making God the author of sin.

9.—*The means proposed by Mr. Jurieu for advancing this agreement.—Princes sovereign Judges of Religion.*

But let us also see the means which Mr. Jurieu proposes for attaining this wonderful agreement‡. "In the first place, (says he,) this pious work cannot be brought about without the concurrence of the princes of both parties, by reason that

---

* Jur. part i. c. viii. 243.
† Part ii. c. xii. p. 261.
‡ Part ii. c. xii. p. 260. n. 1.

(proceeds he) the whole Reformation was made by their authority." Wherefore, in order to promote it, we must assemble—"not Ecclesiastics, always too much wedded to their own sentiments—but politicians*," who, in all appearance, will part with their religion at an easier rate. These, therefore, shall examine "the importance of each tenet, and weigh with equity, whether such and such a proposition, supposing it an error, be capable of being agreed to, or incapable of being tolerated†;" that is to say, what is most essential to religion must be debated in this assembly, it being to decide what is fundamental, and what not; what may be, and what may not be tolerated. Here lies the grand difficulty: but in this difficulty, so essential to religion, "the divines are to speak as lawyers, the politicians are to hearken and judge under the authority of their princes‡." Here, then, manifestly are princes become supreme arbiters of religion, and the substance of faith trusted absolutely in their hands. Whether this be religion, or a mere political agreement, I refer to the reader.

Nevertheless, it must be owned, the reason alleged by Mr. Jurieu for submitting the whole to princes, is convincing, since in reality, as he has just told us, "the whole Reformation was made by their authority§." It is what we have shewn through the whole series of this history: but now, at least, this fact, so ignominious to Protestants, can no longer be disputed. Mr. Jurieu confesses it in plain terms; nor must we wonder that princes have vested in themselves the supreme authority of judgment, in regard to a Reformation which they themselves have made.

For which reason, the Minister has laid it down for the groundwork of the agreement, "that previously to all conferences and disputes, the divines on both sides shall make oath to obey the judgment of their princes' delegates, and to do nothing contrary to the agreement‖." The princes and their delegates are now turned infallible: obedience is sworn to them beforehand, enjoin what they will: that must be believed essential or indifferent, tolerable or intolerable, in religion, which shall please them. And must the fundamental points of Christianity be decided by policy?

---

* Jur. part ii. c. xii. p. 260. n. 4.

† Ibid. p. 263, n. 8.

‡ Ibid.

§ Ibid.

‖ Ibid.

10.—*The Calvinists ready to subscribe the Confession of Augsburg.*

One no longer knows what country he is in, nor whether they are Christians he hears speak, when he sees the main of religion given up to temporal authority, and the sovereign disposal of it resigned to princes. But this is not all; after this, a Confession of Faith must be agreed to, and hence should arise their main perplexity: but the expedient is easy*. They are to make one in indefinite and general terms, which the whole world shall be satisfied with: each must dissemble what may be displeasing to his companion: silence is a remedy for all evils: every man shall believe in his heart just what he lists,—Pelagian, Eutychian, or Manichean; provided he hold his tongue, all will go well, and Jesus Christ will not fail to look on both one and the other for Christians well united. What shall we say? Let us deplore the blindness of our brethren, and beseech God that the enormity of their error may at length open their eyes, so as to become sensible thereof.

But here is the finishing stroke. We have seen what Zuinglius and the Zuinglians, Calvin and the Calvinists, judged of the Confession of Augsburg†: how from its first beginning they refused to subscribe it, and separated themselves from its defenders; how those of France in all succeeding times, in receiving all the rest, have ever excepted the tenth article relating to the Supper. We have seen, among other things, what was said at the conference of Poissy‡; nor forgotten what Calvin then wrote "no less of the suppleness than of the obscure and defective brevity" of this Confession, which was the cause, said he, "that it displeased people of good sense, and even that Melancthon, its author, repented he ever made it;" but at present, great prevalency of that fond desire of uniting with the Lutherans! they are ready to subscribe this Confession; for they are very sensible the Lutherans will never depart from it. Well then, says our minister §, "is no more required of us than to subscribe it? The business is done: we are ready for this subscription, provided you will receive us." Thus you see this Confession, which had been so stoutly rejected these hundred and fifty years, all of a sudden, without any alteration in it, will become the common rule of Calvinists as it is of

---

* Jur. c. xi. p. 245, et seq. c. xii. 268.

† S. l. iii. n. 3. ix. n. 88, 89, 1000, et seq.

‡ Ibid. n. 107.

§ Ibid. c. xiii. p. 171.

Lutherans, upon condition each one shall have the liberty of interpreting and adapting it to his own notions. I leave the reader to decide which of the two ought most to be lamented, the Calvinists, who turn with every wind, or the Lutherans, whose Confession is subscribed only with a view of discovering in it a doctrine suitable to their notions, by the means of those equivocal expressions, of which it is accused. No man but sees how vain, to say no worse, would be this projected union; what would ensue from it of some real consequence is, however, as says Mr. Jurieu*, "that one might make thereof a good confederacy, and that the Protestant party would make the Papists tremble." These were the hopes of Mr. Jurieu, who would be well enough satisfied with the success of his negotiation, if, failing as to a sincere agreement of minds, it could at least unite them so as to set all Europe in a flame; but, luckily for Christendom, leagues are not made as doctors wish.

11.—*Wondrous motives for an union proposed to the Lutherans.*

In this marvellous negotiation nothing is more surprising than the artfulness Mr. Jurieu uses to mollify the hard-hearted Lutherans. What, says he †, will you always be sensible of the complaisance we have shewn, in allowing you your corporal presence? "Besides all these philosophical absurdities which we were forced to digest, how perilous are the consequences of this dogma?" Those do experience it, proceeds he, who are obliged to endure, in France, this continual reproach: "Why do you reject the Catholics after having received the Lutherans? Our people make answer, The Lutherans take not away the substance of the bread: they do not adore the Eucharist: they offer it not in sacrifice: they deprive not the people of one kind: so much the worse for them, we are told, it is in this they argue ill, nor follow their own principles. For, if the body of Jesus Christ be really and carnally present, we ought to adore him: if he be present, we ought to offer him up to his Father: if he be present, Jesus Christ is whole and entire under each species. Do not say you deny these consequences; for, after all, they flow better and more naturally from your dogma than those you impute to us. It is certain your doctrine regarding the Supper was the beginning of error: the change of substance was grounded thereupon: thereupon was adoration commanded; nor is it easy to withstand it: human reason directs us to adore Jesus Christ wheresoever he is. Not that this reason is always good, for God is in a piece of wood and in a stone, yet we may not adore a stone or wood; but, after all, the mind is carried to it by its own propensity, and as natural as the elements tend to their centre: a great struggle is required to hinder our falling into this precipice—(this precipice is worshipping Jesus Christ where he is present;) and I nowise doubt (proceeds our Author) but that the simple amongst you would fall into it, were they not prevented by the continual contests with the Papists." Open your eyes, ye Lutherans, and suffer the Catholics to speak thus to you in their turn. We do not propose that you should worship wood or stone because God is in them: we propose to you to worship Jesus Christ where you acknowledge he is, by so special a presence, attested by so particular and divine a testimony: "reason directs you to it of course; the mind is carried to it by its own propensity." Simple minds, void of contention, would follow so natural a bent, if continual disputes did not restrain them; nor is it anything but the spirit of contention that can hinder the adoration of Jesus Christ where he is believed so present.

---

* p. 262. † p. 240.

12.—*Both parties irreconcilable in the main, according to the Minister Jurieu.*

Such are the conditions of the agreement at this day in treaty between the Lutherans and Calvinists; such are the means they are to use for attaining it; and such the reasons employed to persuade and move the Lutherans. And let not these people go away with the notion, that our speaking of it in this manner proceeds from some fear we may be in of their re-union, which, after all, will never be anything better than grimace and cabal; for in short, for them to convince one another is a thing judged impossible even by Mr. Jurieu. "Never (says he *) will either of the parties suffer itself to be led in triumph; and to propose an agreement between the Lutherans and Calvinists, on condition that one party shall renounce its doctrine, is the same as if you should propose to the Spaniards as a means of agreement, to give up all their provinces and fortresses into the hands of the French. That (says he) is neither just nor possible." Who does not see, on this foundation, that the Lutherans and Calvinists are in the main two nations as irreconcilable and incompatible as any?

---

* Jur. ii, p. cap. i. pp. 138, 141.

They may join in confederacies, but that they ever will be able to arrive at a Christian agreement by the conformity of sentiments, were manifest folly to believe. Nevertheless, they will still continue to say, and one as much as the other, that the Scripture is clear, although conscious in their hearts that this alone can never terminate the least dispute; and all they can do is to patch up agreements, and dissemble what they believe to be the truth clearly revealed by God, or, however, to disguise it, as they have endeavoured a thousand times to do, under equivocal expressions.

Let them, therefore, do what they think fit, and whatsoever God shall suffer them to do in respect to these vain projects of agreements; they will be eternally the mutual punishment and grievance of each other: they will bear eternal testimony one against another, how unhappily they usurped the title of Reformers, and that the method they took for the correction of abuses, could tend to nothing but the subversion of Christianity.

13.—*Query put to the Lutherans and Calvinists.*

But here is something still worse for them. Supposing they were arrived to this mutual toleration, we should then ask them in what rank they would place Luther and Calvin, who make God, in express terms, the author of sin, and thereby stand convicted of a dogma which their disciples now abhor? Who does not see that of two things one will happen, either that they must place this blasphemy, this Manicheism, this "impiety which subverts all religion," amongst the tenets that may be tolerated; or in fine, to the eternal ignominy of the Reformation, Luther must become the horror of the Lutherans, and Calvin of the Calvinists?

INDEX

TO

VOLUME THE SECOND.

REFERRING TO WHATEVER OCCURS UNDER THE SAME TITLES IN THE FIRST VOLUME.

Ablution. What the ablution was which the Vaudois condemned in Baptism, 107.

Adam. The sin of Adam ordained by God, according to the Calvinists, 221.

Adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, rejected by the Brethren o Bohemia, 151—alterations made by the Calvinists in respect to the Adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, 267—they tolerate in the Lutherans the internal acts of this Adoration, and reject the external, which are but tokens thereof, 268—*Vide* Vol. I.

Albigenses (The) well treated by the Calvinists, and why, 53—those of Toulouse bore the name of Petrobusians, 71—Council of Lombez against them. Famous examination of these Heretics, *ib.*—why they are called Arians, 72—the Albigenses are Manicheans, and, by consequence, different from the Vaudois, 77, *et seq.*—the Albigenses comprised by Renier in the list of the Manichean Churches, 79—they came from the Manicheans of Bulgaria, 80—the Pope of the Albigenses in Bulgaria, 81—their profound hypocrisy, 82—the agreeableness of their propositions with those of Faustus the Manichean, *ib.*—their hypocrisy confounded by St. Bernard, *ib.*—their infamy, 83—they teach that the effect of the Sacraments depends on the holiness of the Ministers, *ib.*—they condemn all oaths and punishment of crimes, 84—proof of their being Manicheans, *ib.*—Protestants reap nothing but shame by challenging the Albigenses for their ancestors, 88—reflections on the history of the Albigenses and Vaudois; artifice of the Ministers, 121—the Albigenses unquestionably Manicheans, 122—the Albigenses of Metz were Manicheans, 123—sixteen Churches of the Manicheans comprehended the whole Sect, 126—inevitable condemnation of these Heretics from their denying their religion, 131—how the Vaudois sprung from the Manichean Albigenses, 162.

Amboise. Conspiracy of Amboise, 16—entered upon from a maxim of conscience, according to Beza, *ib.*—the riot of Amboise was the work of Protestants, and had religion for its motive, *ib.*—the Huguenots' discovering the conspiracy does not justify the party, 19—the protestation of the conspirators does not justify them, *ib.*—what is said by Mr. Jurieu concerning the conspiracy of Amboise, 30.

Amissibility of justice received by the English under Elizabeth, 14—doctrine of the Arminians concerning the amissibility of justice, 232—*Vide* Vol. I.

Antichrist. The Synod of Gap adds an article to the Confession of Faith on purpose to declare the Pope Antichrist, 191—Daniel and St. Paul quoted in vain to prove the Pope is Antichrist, 192—the Protestants discredit themselves by this doctrine, 193—this doctrine concerning Antichrist was not in any act of the Reformation; Luther inserts it in the article of Smalcald, 194—but Melancthon opposes it, *ib.*—this doctrine relating to Antichrist how despised even in the Reformation, 195—it is refuted by the most learned Protestants, Grotius, Hammond, and Jurieu himself, 196—examination of Joseph Mede's and the Minister Jurieu's doctrine on this point, 197, 198—Jurieu sets a new date for the birth of Antichrist, 199—he varies, and is for advancing the downfal of Antichrist, 201.

Arminians, or Remonstrants, upheld by Barneveld against the Prince of Orange, 228—they are condemned in the Provincial Synods, *ib.*—the Synod of Dort is assembled against them, 229—the dispute reduced to five heads; declaration of the Arminians on these five heads, *ib.*—the purport of their declaration in respect to Predestination, and their doctrine touching the Baptism of Infants, 230—their declaration concerning the universality of Redemption, 231—their doctrine concerning Grace, *ib.*—and concerning the amissibility of Justice, 232—their whole dispute concerning two essential words, 233—their ground-work, viz., that there is no gratuitous preference in behalf of the elect, *ib.*—wherein the Catholics agreed with, and disagreed from, the Arminians, 234—they require of the Synod of Dort a distinct decision, 235—requests of the Arminians, who complain they are judged by their adverse parties, 250—they insist on the same reasons that the whole Protestant party employed against the Church, *ib.*—their mouths are stopped by the authority of the States, 251—they protest against the Synod, *ib.*—the Synod of Delph, in order to silence them, is forced to have recourse to the assistance of the Holy Ghost promised to Councils, 254—they are put in hopes of an Œcumenical Council, 255—the Arminians are deposed and excommunicated by the Synod of Dort, 257.

Arminius. Peter Du Moulin places Arminius's opinions amongst things indifferent, 187—Arminius's dispute and excesses, 227—the disputes end not with his death; Barneveld upholds his disciples against the Prince of Orange, 228.

Aubertin. This Minister's gross evasion with respect to the belief of the Vaudois concerning the Eucharist, 101—his frivolous objection in order to shew that these Heretics denied the Reality, 102—he artfully confounds the Vaudois with the Albigenses, 122—Aubertin's allusion on the same subject, 126.

Ay. The Synod of Ay in 1615 approves the proposals of Peter du Moulin for a common Confession of Faith, 186—reflection on this approbation of the Synod of Ay, 187.

Baptism believed useless by the Manicheans, 62—ceremonies of baptism despised by the Vaudois, 106—the brethren of Bohemia re-baptized every body, 145—Peter du Moulin, approved by the Synod of Ay, is against condemning the necessity of Baptism, 188—doctrine of the Remonstrants, or Arminians, touching infant baptism, and what they would conclude from it, 230—the Synod of Dort s decision on infant baptism, 236—*Vide* Vol. I.

Barneveld upholds the Arminians against the Prince of Orange, 228.

Basil. What the Council of Basil allowed to the Calixtins, 142.

Berengarius impugns only the Real Presence, 52—he never separated from Rome, 53—Berengarius attacked the Reality after the Manicheans of Orleans, 364—he is condemned and recants, *ib.*—his first Confession of Faith, *ib.*—he varies as well as his disciples, and makes a second Confession of Faith, 365—they invent Impanation and Invination, 366—their Doctrine opposite to that of the whole Church, 367—Berengarius owns as much, *ib.*—no necessity of a General Council in order to condemn him, 368.

Bernard (St.) consulted about the Manicheans that dwelt near Cologne, 68—account of the tenets of these Heretics, whom he had been well acquainted with at Toulouse, 69—he confounds their hypocrisy, 82—answer to the objection relating to the credulity of St. Bernard, 86—he lays nothing to the charge of Peter de Bruis and Henry, the seducers of the Toulousians, but what he knows, 87—what he says of the behaviour of the Toulousian Heretics, 127—this Saint's memorable answer in regard to the false constancy of Heretics, 130.

Beza owns that the conspiracy of Amboise was undertaken through a maxim of conscience, 16—he is for rising in arms, *ib.*—what he says concerning the motive of the Calvinian wars in France, 28—how he authorizes the civil wars, *ib.*—what he says touching the assassination of the Duke of Guise by Poltrot, 35—Beza's ridiculous pretensions in favour of the antiquity of the Vaudois, 53—what he says of their Doctrine shews they were not Calvinists, 114—in 1571 Beza presides in the national Synod of Rochelle, where those that were for changing the Supper article in the Confession of Faith are condemned, 167—by the Synod's orders, he answers the Swiss offended at its decision, that it only regarded France, 171—he is of the number of those that were deputed by the Frankfort assembly to draw up one common Confession of Faith, 175—he makes God the author of sin, 221—this doctrine of Beza taken from Calvin, 222—the Dogmata he adds to those of Luther, *ib.*—what he says of the certainty of particular mens' salvation, 223—he teaches, after Calvin, that justifying Faith is not lost in a criminal state, 225.

Blandrate. George Blandrate, one of the heads of the Socinians, 360.

Bishops. Constancy of the English Catholic Bishops, who are deposed for refusing to own Queen Elizabeth's supremacy, 9, 13—decisions in matters of Faith reserved to the royal authority by the declaration of the English Protestant Bishops, 12.

Bohemia. The sect of the Bohemian Brethren falsely called Vaudois, 131—why they disown those who call them Vaudois, 131, 132—and Picards, 133—they boast their descent from John Huss, *ib.*—they divide from the Calixtins, 141—the bloody wars of the Calixtins trouble all Bohemia, *ib.*—they make to themselves an ignorant lay Pastor, 144—weak beginning of this Sect, 145—they only took the name of John Huss but did not follow his doctrine; their extreme ignorance and assurance to re-baptize the whole world, *ib.*—their fruitless search throughout the universe after a Church of their belief, 147—how they sought Ordination in the Catholic Church; reproaches made them by Luther, 148—their Doctrine in respect to the seven Sacraments, 149—they change it in their Reformed Confession of Faith, *ib.*—what they thought of the Eucharist, 149, 150—the manner in which they refused to adore Jesus Christ, a proof that they believed the Reality even out of the actual use of the Sacrament, 151—their uncertainty and affected ambiguities, 152—the Calvinists and Lutherans each strive to bring them to their side; they incline to the latter, 153—Luther gives them his approbation; their Festivals, their Temples, their Fasts, and the Celibacy of their Priests, 154—they take shelter in Poland, 155—there they unite with the Lutherans and Zuinglians, *ib.*—what disposition they were in for this agreement, 157—reflections on this union, *ib.*

Breaking. Important article of the Conference of Cassel, concerning the breaking of the Eucharistic Bread, 271.

Bull, a learned English Protestant, maintains the Infallibility of the Council of Nice and that of the other general Councils, 347.

Burnet. His imposition in asserting that the Doctrine established under Edward VI. was not changed, 6—what Mr. Burnet says of the indifference of the English as to the Real Presence, 7—a memorable passage of Mr. Burnet concerning the English Reformation, 13—his illusion in regard to the wars of the Huguenots, 25—his gross mistakes and prodigious ignorance relating to the affairs of France, 26—sequel of his fallacies, *ib.*—*Vide* Vol. I.

Calixtins. The Sect of the Calixtins rises up in Bohemia, 141—why called Calixtins, 142—the Compactatum, or the four articles allowed to the Calixtins by the Council of Basil, *ib.*—the Calixtins disposed to acknowledge the Pope, 143—the reason of their so great respect for Wickliff's memory; their ambition hinders them from re-uniting with the Church, *ib.*—the Bohemian Brethren separate from them, 144.

Calixtus, a famous Lutheran, establishes in Germany the union of Sects, and is followed in France by the Minister d'Husseau, 311.

Calumny. The decree of the Synod of Charenton in 1631 convicts the Calvinists of calumny, 266.

Calvin. His connivance at the conspiracy of Amboise, 20—his death, 41—in what manner issued from the Vaudois and Albigenses, 163—his evasions in regard to the vain predictions of Luther concerning the Papacy, 192—he made God the author of Adam's sin, 222—the Dogmata by him added to those of Luther, *ib.*—his Doctrine of the Certainty of Salvation defined by the Synod of Dort, 244—*Vide* Vol. I.

Calvinists (The) of France receive the English Doctrine, making the King head of the Church, 13—change of their Doctrine, 15—their conspiracy at Amboise, *ib.*—they take up arms by a maxim of Religion, *ib.*—the first civil wars which the whole Calvinist Party concurs to, 21—decisions of their national Synods in approbation of their arming, 22—what spirit actuated them in these wars, 24—their false pretence that these wars did not concern Religion, 25—perplexity of the French Calvinists to justify these wars, 27—they are convicted by Beza, 28—their other wars destitute of all pretext, 30—whether the spirit of their Reformation were a spirit of meekness or violence, 31—fatal consequences of their violent spirit, 32—their vain excuses, 33—their cruelties, *ib.*—why our Calvinists examine less into the question of Free-will than the Zuinglians, 46—the reason of their keeping such a stir about the Albigenses and Vaudois, 53—the present Vaudois are their Disciples, 115—they have not one contemporary Author that favours their pretensions touching the Vaudois, 116—all are welcome to the Calvinists, if they but exclaim against the Pope, 141—in what manner they descended from the Albigenses and Vaudois, 163—they seek in vain the succession of Persons in the precedent Sects, *ib.*—still less do they find amongst them the succession of Doctrine, 165—many Calvinists of France are for changing the article of the Supper in the Confession of Faith, but are condemned by a national Synod, 166, 167—they assemble at St. Foy, and give the power to four Ministers of changing their Confession of Faith, 176—a letter wherein the Calvinists own Luther and Melancthon for their fathers, 178—they have continued to our days the project of a common Confession, but always to no purpose, *ib.*—they receive the Lutherans to their Communion, 180, 264—the unsettled spirit of Calvinism, 180—the Calvinists detest Piscator's Doctrine, 181—the Doctrine of the Calvinists against Piscator solves all the difficulties they object to us on the sacrifice of the Mass, 182—the impiety of their Doctrine touching imputed justice, as it is proposed by the Synods which condemn Piscator, 184—reflection on their procedure against Piscator, 185—they add an article to their Confession of Faith in order to declare the Pope Antichrist, 191—intolerable excesses of Calvinism concerning Free-will,—221—they make God the author of sin, *ib.*—they believe as a fundamental point that every one of the faithful is sure of his perseverance and salvation, 223—they are sensible of these excesses, so contrary to the fear and trembling prescribed by St. Paul, 224—they maintain that justifying Faith is not lost in a criminal state, 225—what texts of Scripture they ground themselves on, 226—the perplexity they are under to answer this question, "What would become of a Believer should he die in his sin?" *ib.*—these difficulties have reclaimed many Calvinists, 227—they are contrary to the Lutherans and Remonstrants both, in the point of Grace, 232—contradiction of their Doctrine, 238—they promise the Arminians an Œcumenical Council, 255—the illusion of this promise, *ib.*—the Calvinists of France receive the Synod of Dort, 256—their union with the Lutherans in 1631, 264—they never before had advanced so far towards it, *ib.*—this conduct of theirs convicts them of calumny, 265—they tolerate in the Lutherans the interior acts of Adoration, and reject the exterior, which are but tokens of the former, 268—their perplexity concerning the distinction of fundamental points, 270—they are forced to own that the Church of Rome is a true Church, wherein salvation may be had, *ib.*—the Calvinists of Marpurg agree with the Lutherans of Rintel in the Conference of Cassel, 270, 271—what is said by the Calvinists of France concerning the visibility of the Church, 292—they own that the Church of the Creed is visible, *ib.*—they always suppose the Church's perpetual visibility, 294—they exclude the Church of Rome from the title of a true Church, *ib.*—they own the interruption of the Ministry, and the cessation of the visible Church, 295—their perplexity, in that the invisible Church had been forgotten in their Confession, 296.

Camerarius writes the history of the Bohemian Brethren, 131—he says, they disown those who called them Vaudois, 132.

Cameron's, and his Disciples', Doctrine concerning universal Grace, 272.

Catholics. The constancy of the Catholic Bishops in England in opposition to Queen Elizabeth's innovations, 9—demonstration that the Catholics were neither ignorant of nor dissembled the Doctrine of the Vaudois, 108—wherein the Catholics were different from the Remonstrants and Lutherans with regard to justifying Grace, 234.

Celibacy of Priests retained by the Bohemian Brethren, 154.

Ceremonies retained by Queen Elizabeth, 2—the Ceremonies of Baptism despised by the Vaudois, 106.

Certainty of Salvation taught, 43—this certainty of Salvation the chief foundation of the Calvinian Religion, 223—certainty of Salvation as sure to Calvinists as if revealed to them by God himself, *ib.*—this certainty opposite to the fear and trembling prescribed by St. Paul, 234—the Synod of Dort's decision on the certainty of Salvation, 233—certainty of Salvation a false allurement, 243—whether the certainty of Salvation confirmed by the Synod of Dort be different from trust, *ib.*—whether this certainty be a certainty of Faith, 245—the sentiment of the Divines of Great Britain, 246—*Vide* Vol. I.

Charenton. The Synod of Charenton in 1631 receives the Lutherans to Communion, 264—memorable decree of this Synod, *ib.*—consequence of this decree, *ib.*—remarkable date of this decree, 265—great turn in controversies by means of this decree; it convicts the Calvinists of calumny, *ib.*—it makes void the chief subject of their rupture, 266—novelties following from this decree, 267—decree of the Synod of Charenton in 1620 in approbation of that of Dort, 256.

Children. The Synod of Dort acknowledges the sanctification of all baptized children, 249.

Church. Elizabeth completes the work of church-plundering, 13—difference between the conduct of the Church and that of Protestants, 31—eminent sanctity in the Catholic Church, 129—the Reformation allows private people to take on themselves a greater ability for understanding sound Doctrine than it allows the whole Church besides, 260—the Calvinists forced to own that the Church of Rome is a true Church, and that her Members may be saved, 270—the cause of the Protestant Churches' Variations proceeded from their not knowing what the Church was, 281—the Catholic Church always knew herself, and never varied in her decisions, *ib.*—the Doctrine of Catholics on the article concerning the Church, 282—notions of Protestants on the perpetual visibility of the Church, *ib.*—this Doctrine relating to the Church confessed by Protestants, is the ruin of their Reformation and the source of their perplexity, 283—the perpetual visibility of the Church confirmed by the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, 284—this visibility confirmed in the Smalcaldic articles by the promises of Jesus Christ, 285—in the Saxonic Confession of Faith, 286—in the Wirtemberg Confession of Faith, *ib.*—in the Bohemian Confession of Faith, 287—in the Confession of Strasburg, 288—in both the Confessions of Basil, and in that of the Swiss in 1566, *ib.*—the beginning of their Variation; the Invisible Church begins to appear, 289—the Invisible Church why invented, 290—what the English say of her, 291—what the pretended Reformed of France say of her in their Catechism, 292—they own at length that the Church of the Creed is visible, *ib.*—the expressions of their Confessions of Faith suppose a perpetual visibility of the Church, 294—there they take from the Church of Rome the title of a true Church, *ib.*—there they acknowledge the interruption of the Ministry, and the cessation of the visible Church, 295—their perplexity in the Synods of Gap and Rochelle on account that the Invisible Church had been forgotten in their Confession, 296—how important is the controversy relating to the Church, 299—the Ministers no longer dispute the Church's Visibility, *ib.*—according to the principles of the Minister, Claude, all that is necessary for Salvation is in the Church of Rome, 304.

Claude of Turin, an Arian, breaks Images, and is accounted amongst the predecessors of the Protestants, 52.

Claude (Mr.), his frivolous evasion with respect to the Synod of Sainte-Foy, where a design was in hand of making one common Confession for all Protestants, 179—how much he disapproves the Church of Geneva for having added two articles of Faith to her Confession, 274

—this Minister's vain subtlety in order to elude what the Synods of Gap in 1603, and Rochelle in 1607, had decided concerning the Church, 297—what is said by him with respect to the vocation of the Reformers, 298—he very positively owns the Church's visibility, 299—this visibility enters into the definition he makes of the Church, 301—he saves the Elect before the Reformation under the Ministry of the Church of Rome, 302—according to his principles, all things necessary for Salvation are in the Church of Rome, 304—he owns, that before the Reformation their Doctrine was unknown, 306—he varies with respect to the Church's visibility, 309.

Communion, under one or both kinds, held for indifferent in the ancient Church, 58—Communion under one kind impugned by John Huss, 140—and by the Calixtins, 142—Communion under both kinds is granted them, *ib.*—demonstration in favour of Communion under one kind, 271—Communion under one kind is sufficient, 370.

Compactatum, what it means, 142.

Confession. The Vaudois believed Confession of sins to a Priest, 104, 107—sacramental Confession owned by John Huss, 140.

Confession of Faith. New Confession of Faith of the Helvetic or Swiss Churches, 41—remarkable Confession of the Polonian Zuinglians, 48—a spurious Confession of Faith of the Vaudois, 119—a Confession of Faith falsely attributed to Wickliff, 138—Confession of Faith of the Bohemian Brethren in 1504, wherein they acknowledge seven Sacraments, 149—this is altered by them, *ib.*—endeavours are used at Frankfort to make all the defenders of the figurative sense to agree in one common Confession of Faith, 173—the Lutherans were to be comprised in this Confession, 174—qualities of this new Confession of Faith, and deputies named to draw it up, 175—consent of the Synod of Sainte-Foy to this new Confession, 176—the project of a common Confession continued to our days and always unsuccessfully, 178—the Synod of Dort declares their Confessions of Faith may be retouched, yet, at the same time, obliges to subscribe them, 256—the Church of Geneva adds two articles of Faith to her Confession, 274.

Confirmation. What was believed by the Vaudois concerning this Sacrament, 106.

Conspiracy of Amboise—*Vide* Amboise.

Constance. Wickliff's Doctrine was not calumniated at the Council of Constance, 136—reasons of the Council of Constance for authorizing the already established custom of Communion under one kind, 370.

Council. By the Doctrine of the Dort Synod, Protestants are obliged to submit to a Council of the Catholic Church, 253—to stop the mouths of the Arminians, the Synod of Delph is forced to have recourse to the Holy Ghost's assistance promised to Councils, 254—the Calvinists promise the Arminians an Œcumenical Council, 255—the fallacy of this promise, *ib.*

Crosses. The new Manicheans' aversion to the Cross, 59.

Crucifix. Elizabeth, Queen of England, retains the Crucifix in her Chapel, 3.

Cruelties of the Calvinists, 33.

Cup, allowed to the Calixtins upon certain conditions, 142.

Decisions in matters of faith reserved to the royal authority by the declaration of the English Protestant Bishops, 12.

Declaration of the English Protestant Clergy in regard to Queen Elizabeth's supremacy, 9—how Protestants palliate so great an evil, 10.

De Dominis. Anthony de Dominis one of the first authors of indifferency, 311.

Delph. The Synod of Delph is forced, in order to silence the Arminians, to fly to the Holy Ghost's assistance promised to Councils, 255.

Dort. Convocation of the Synod of Dort; its opening, 228, 229—the disputes there reduced to five heads, 229—the Synod's decision on faith in the sole elect, and on the certainty of salvation, 235—and on infant baptism, 236—second decision on faith in the sole elect, *ib.*—on the certainty of the faithful, 237—what is said by it concerning habits infused, 238—monstrous doctrine of the Synod on the inamissibility of justice, *ib.*—it teaches into what crime the faithful do not fall, 239—what is the certainty of salvation it admits, 240—it teaches that all uncertainty is a temptation, *ib.*—in what manner, according to this Synod, man justified is guilty of death, 241—whether the sense of the Synod concerning inamissibility was taken right, and whether the certainty by it asserted be different from trust, 243—the Synod expressly defines Calvin's doctrine on this point, 244—it approves the sentiment of Peter Du Moulin, 245—whether the certainty it establishes be a certainty of faith, *ib.*—the sentiment of the Divines of Great Britain, 246—sentiment of those of Bremen, 248—whether the Synod can be excused from all these excesses; unanimous consent of all the votes, 249—the Synod owns the sanctification of all baptized children; consequence from this doctrine, *ib.*—procedure of the Synod, 250—it silences the Arminians by authority of the States, 251—the reasons used against them in the Synod condemn the whole Protestant party, *ib.*—there it is decided that the weakest and newest party ought to yield to the greatest and most ancient, 252—perplexity of the Synod upon the protest of the Remonstrants, *ib.*—according to the Synod of Dort Protestants were obliged to submit to the Council of the Catholic Church, 253—resolution of the Synod obliging to subscribe the Confession of Faith, which, at the same time, it owned might be mended and reviewed, 256—the Synod of Dort is approved by the Calvinists of France, *ib.*—it deposes and excommunicates the Arminians, 257—the decisions of Dort far from essential, according to Mr. Jurieu, *ib.*—the Minister Jurieu makes the Synod of Dort act rather by policy than truth, 259—the Synod of Dort heals none of their evils, and, spite of its decrees, Mr. Jurieu is a Pelagian, 261—connivance of the Dort Synod not only at the excesses of the Reformers, but at those of the Arminians, 263.

Du Moulin (Peter) proposes expedients for making one common Confession for all Protestants, 178, 179—his memorial approved by the Synod of Ay in 1615, 186—this Minister's remarkable words concerning the dissimulation he would have used in regard of this common Confession, 187—reflections on these words of Du Moulin approved by the Synod of Ay, *ib.*—Du Moulin's inconstancy, 188—he will not have the Real Presence, Ubiquity, and the other Lutheran tenets, be condemned, *ib.*—Du Moulin's sentiment on Grace approved by the Synod of Dort, 245—Du Moulin strenuously opposes Cameron and his disciples, 272.

Du Perron (the Cardinal) grants that the Pope's superiority over General Council—and Secular Powers is not of faith, 383.

Du Val (Mr.) is consulted by the Ultramontanes concerning the Pope's infallibility and his sentiments thereon, 383.

Edward VI., King of England; his Reformation changed by Elizabeth, 2—the twenty-ninth article of his Confession concerning the Eucharist is changed, 5—material alterations in his Liturgy, 6—in Edward's time, neither the word Substance, nor the miracles which Calvin admits in the Eucharist, are employed, 8.

Elect, saved under the ministry and in the communion of the Church of Rome before the Reformation, by the confession of Mr. Claude, and since by that of Mr. Jurieu, 312, 313.

Elizabeth, Queen of England; her profound policy; she orders a tender of her respects to Paul IV. at his accession to the Papal throne, 2—she engages in the new Reformation, *ib.*—her scruples in four points, that of the Ceremonies, that of Images, that of the Real Presence, and that of the regal Supremacy; her judgment on the two first, 2, 3—her judgment on the Eucharist, 4—neither the word Substance, nor the miracles admitted by Calvin in the Eucharist, are used under Elizabeth, 8—her Supremacy in Spirituals is set up in spite of her scruples, *ib.*—she completes what had been left undone in the pillaging of Churches, 13—she secretly favours the inclination towards a revolt in the Calvinists of France, 15.

England. Variation of the English on the Eucharist, 4—the English are indifferent as to the Real Presence, 7—the Supremacy in Spirituals is given by the English to Queen Elizabeth, 8—the Parliament of England reserves to itself the decisions in matters of Faith, 10—the Doctrine of the English, making their King Head of the Church, condemned by the Calvinists, 13—remarkable passage of Mr. Burnet concerning the Reformation of England, *ib.*—the English reject the inamissibility of justice, 14—the sentiment of the English Divines for the certainty of salvation, defined in the Synod of Dort, 246—they believed that justice could never be lost: contradiction of their Doctrine, *ib.*—according to them, faith and charity abide in the worst of sinners, 247—what it is, according to them, that the Holy Ghost does in such as abide in grievous crimes, 248—the Test in England; therein the English draw near to our sentiments, and condemn the Church of Rome only through manifest error, 276—the English speak ambiguously of the Church's visibility, 291—*Vide* Vol. I.

Episcopius, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, appears at the head of the Arminians in the Synod of Dort, 229.

Equivocations of the Manicheans in Germany in matters of faith, 67—equivocations of the Bohemian brethren, 152.

Error. All error contradicts itself, 242.

Eucharist. What is believed by the Swiss or Zuinglians relating to the Eucharist, 46, 47—the abominable Eucharist peculiar to the Manicheans, 61—John Huss believed, as to the Eucharist, all that the Church of Rome believes, 139.

Faith. Decisions in point of faith reserved to the Royal authority by a declaration of Bishops, 12—the Swiss attribute true faith to the elect alone, 43—the faith of the Calvinists of France put in the hands of four Ministers, 177—justifying faith not lost in the state of grievous sin, according to the Calvinists, 225—decision of the Synod of Dort touching the faith of the elect, 236.

Fasts practised by the Bohemian Brethren, 154.

Fathers (Holy); how they answered the Manicheans in respect to their practices, 56—all of them understood the words of St. Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 1, as meant of the Manicheans, *ib.*

Festivals in honour of the Saints retained by the Bohemian brethren, 154.

Figure. The Zuinglians the most sincere of all the defenders of the figurative sense, 48—it is endeavoured at Frankfort to bring all the defenders of the figurative sense to agree in one common Confession of Faith, 173.

France, the disturbances of, began by means of Queen Elizabeth, 15.

Francis, Duke of Guise, is assassinated by Poltrot, and this murder accounted in the Reformation an act of Religion, 35.

Frankfort, Assembly of, in 1577; where means are used to bring all the defenders of the figurative sense to agree in one common Confession of Faith, 173—this Assembly writes to the Lutherans in order to mollify them, 175—it lessens, in their behalf, the difficulty of the Real Presence, 176—difference between what was designed to be done in favour of the Lutherans at Frankfort, and what was since done at Charenton, 180.

Free-will. Monstrous Doctrine of the Zuinglians or Swiss, touching free-will, 45—our Calvinists examine less into this subject, and why, 46—Free-will destroyed in Calvinism, 221—how it acts according to the Synod of Dort, 230—Calvin's and the Calvinists' error, endeavouring to make Free-will consist with Necessity, 222, 234—the Council of Trent's decisions on Free-will conformably to those of antiquity, 375—*Vide* Vol. I.

Gap, the national Synod of, detests Piscator's Doctrine, 181—it adds an article to the Confession of Faith to declare the Pope Antichrist, 191—decision of the Synod of Gap on this point; its false foundation, 194—occasion of this decree, 195—this Synod's perplexity, for that the invisible Church had been forgotten in the Confession of Faith, 296—this Synod's memorable decision on extraordinary vocation, 297.

Geneva, strange answer of those of, to the Arminians' request at the Synod of Dort, 253—decree passed at Geneva against universal Grace, and the question resolved by the Magistrate, 273—the Church of Geneva adds two articles to her Confession of Faith, 274.

Germany, present state of controversies in, 272.

God. Wickliff's Theology concerning the liberty, the goodness, and the power of God, 133—God author of sin, according to the Calvinists, 221—*Vide* Vol. I.

Gog, and *Magog*, 162.

Gomar maintains Calvinism against Arminius; his disciples take the name of Counter-Remonstrants, and the Prince of Orange upholds them, 228.

Gomarists, or Counter-Remonstrants, 228.

Grace, the inamissibility of, defined at Dort, 232—Doctrine of the Arminians on Grace, *ib.*—Cameron's and his disciples' sentiments on universal Grace admitted by the Doctors of the Dort Synod, 272—Sufficient Grace admitted by them, 273—decree passed at Geneva against universal Grace, *ib.*

Grotius demonstrates that the Pope cannot be Antichrist, 196—he proves from the Protestants, that, by their own confession, souls may depart out of the body without being wholly purified, 380.

Hebrew. Decision of the Swiss, touching the Hebrew text, ridiculed by the learned of the sect, 274.

Henry, disciple of Peter de Bruis, in the eleventh century, 53—secretly diffuses his master's errors in Dauphiny, Provence, and about Toulouse, 69—his doctrine, 85.

Heretics. Catholics and Protestants agreed in the punishing of Heretics, 40—memorable answer of St. Bernard on the false constancy of

Heretics, 130—what is the succession of Heretics, 165—character of Heresy owned in the Reformation, 187.

Huss (John), a disciple of Wickliff, 139—he imitates Wickliff in his hatred of the Pope, *ib.*—says Mass, 52—and judges no otherwise concerning the Eucharist than those of the Church of Rome, 139—why John Huss's doctrine was doubted of, 140—he was a Catholic in all the now controverted points, except Communion under both kinds, and the Pope, *ib.*—the Bohemian Brethren account him a great martyr, although they follow not his doctrine, 145—Luther accuses John Huss of his ignorance in the point of Justification, 148.

Hussites (The) divided amongst themselves, 145.

Images. Queen Elizabeth, at first, is for retaining images, 3—she is persuaded by false reasons to condemn them, nevertheless retains the crucifix in her chapel, *ib.*—images broken by Claude of Turin, an Arian, 52—they are honoured by Wickliff, 137—and John Huss, 140.

Inamissibility of justice rejected by the English under Elizabeth, 14—taught by the Swiss, 43—the Dort Synod's prodigious doctrine on inamissibility of justice, 238—whether it was right understood, 243.

Incarnation. This mystery an imposition, according to the Manicheans, 56—and according to the Albigenses, 124.

Infallibility owned in the Church by the Minister Jurieu, 338—this Infallibility admits of no restriction in dogmata, 344—the Church is ever constant; is ever in possession of the truth when beginning to be attacked; her decisions are plain, her steadiness not to be shaken, 363, 369, 388—*Vide* Jurieu, *vide* Vol. I.

Innocent III. (Pope). The Vaudois come to ask his approbation, 94—he approves the Institute of the Minor Brethren, *ib.*—he holds the Council of Lateran, where he condemns the Vaudois, 95.

Invocation of Saints, received by Wickliff, 137—and by John Huss, 140.

Jane, Queen of Navarre, exercises horrid cruelties on priests and religious persons, 33.

Jerome, of Prague, disciple of John Huss, follows him entirely, 140.

Joseph Mede, an English Protestant, renders himself famous by his extravagancies on the Revelations, 202—he accuses St. Leo the Great, St. Basil, and the rest of the Saints, their contemporaries, of idolatry, 204—Joseph Mede and Mr. Jurieu contradict one another, 213—his prediction in behalf of the King of Swedeland no sooner uttered than proved false, 214—what was discovered by him in the Revelations touching the Reformers, 218.

Jurieu (Mr.), what was said by him concerning the civil wars excited by the Calvinists, 30—what concerning those who teach the distinction betwixt Bishops and Priests, 189—he maintains the Pope to be Antichrist, and an article of Faith for all true Christians, 197—he varies on this point, 201—exposition of Mr. Jurieu's doctrine on the 11th, 12th, and 13th chapters of the Revelations, 198—he is bent on shortening the time of the pretended prophecies, *ib.*—he owns his prepossession; he forsakes his guides; and why, *ib.*—the impossibility he is under of settling the epoch for the twelve hundred and sixty years which the Reformation is determined to allow for Antichrist's persecution, 199—he gives a new date to the birth of Antichrist, *ib.*—the time not suiting, because of the holiness of the then Pope, 200—Jurieu changes his mind, and is for advancing the downfal of Antichrist, 201—he makes Antichrist to be born in the person of St. Leo the Great, 202—absurdity of this system, *ib.*—vain shift of this Minister, 203—he imputes to St. Leo two evil characters, *ib.*—he accuses St. Leo, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, &c. of idolatry, 204—why he does not make St. Basil the beginner of Antichristianism as well as St. Leo, 206—his ridiculous calculation, 207—he ill explains the seven Kings of the Revelations, 208—explains as ill the ten Kings of the Revelations, 211—frivolous answer of Mr. Jurieu on this head, 212—the opposition of Jurieu and Joseph Mede to one another, 213—his ridiculous notions concerning the Turk, 215—he owns the Prophets of the Protestant party to be cheats; his idea of the Reformation, 216—his sentiment on the decisions of Dort, 257—Semi-Pelagianism does not damn according to this author, 258—he makes the Synod of Dort act more by policy than truth, 259—he declares they were ready to bear with Semi-Pelagianism in the Arminians, *ib.*—he is a Pelagian, notwithstanding the decrees of Dort, 261—he falls back into the excesses the Reformers were guilty of in respect to the cause of sin, 262—according to this Minister, the disputes touching Predestination do not longer concern any essential point of religion, 269—what he confesses of the Variation of Protestants in regard to the Church's perpetual visibility, 300, 309—in his notion, you may save your soul in all communions, 310—this he took from the Socinians, *ib.*—he comes into the sentiments of Mr. Pajon, *ib.*—is blamed for favouring the Socinians, 311—grants that we may be saved in the Church of Rome, 312—owns the excesses of his Confession of Faith, 317—overthrows the ideas of the Reformation; impugns the doctrine of his Church relating to excommunication, 319—amongst his brethren, Confessions of Faith are nothing but arbitrary contracts, 320—he establishes the independent principle, 321—he makes the authority and subordination of Churches to depend on Princes, 322—he confesses that this his system is contrary to the faith of all ages, 324—he contradicts himself when he pretends the Council of Nice sides with him, 325—he undermines the authority of the Apostolic Creed, 327—he accuses the Church contemporary with the Apostles of schism and heresy, 329—according to him, one may save himself among the Socinians, 330—and, by the same principles, among Mahometans and Jews, 331—and, at the same time, speaks *pro* and *con.* touching the perpetual visibility of the Church, 333—and touching the Universal Church's teaching and preaching, 337—he will have the general consent of the Universal Church to be a demonstration, 339—he condemns his own Church by the characters he gives to the Universal Church, 341—confessing the infallibility of the Church, he must confess that of General Councils, 345—he takes from pastors the title of judges, contrary to the sense of his own Churches, 348—he is against all subscribing to Councils, 349—he is for sacrificing truth to peace, 350.

Justice, inherent, acknowledged by Protestants, 372—*Vide* Justification.

Justification. Luther reproaches John Huss with utter ignorance of Justification, 148—Piscator's doctrine on this head, 181—detested by the Calvinists, *ib.*—decree of the National Synod of Privas touching Justification, 182—impiety of the Calvinists' doctrine on Justification, as proposed by their Synods, 184—perspicuity and plainness of the Catholic doctrine on the same subject, *ib.*—the Arminians' doctrine on Justification, 232—monstrous doctrine of the Dort Synod on the same point, 238—the ancient Church's doctrine conformable to that of Trent, 372—*Vide* Vol. I.

Kelesiski, a shoemaker, puts himself at the head of the Bohemian Brethren, and compiles for them a body of doctrine, 144.

Kings. Wickliff's pernicious doctrine concerning Kings, 136—system of the Ministers, concerning the seven Kings in the Revelations, confounded by the terms of this prophecy, 208—the ten Kings in the Revelations evidently as ill explicated, 211.

Leo (St.). Jurieu makes Antichrist be born in the person of St. Leo the Great, 202—absurdity of this system, *ib.*—two evil characters attributed to St. Leo by this Minister, 203—pretended idolatry of St. Leo, 204.

Liturgy of Edward VI. changed in essential points, 6.

Lombez. Council of Lombez against the Albigenses, 71—history of this Council, 72.

London. Synod of London in 1562, wherein Queen Elizabeth's supremacy is received, 9—Council of London against Wickliff, 138.

Luther reproaches the Bohemian Brethren with their utter ignorance of Justification, 148—Luther gives them his approbation, and how, 153—the Calvinists acknowledge Luther for their father, 178—Luther's vain predictions concerning the downfal of the Papacy, 192—he inserts in the Smalcaldic Articles that the Pope is Antichrist, 194—*Vide* Vol. I.

Lutherans, ill treated by the Polish Zuinglians, 48—who afterwards enter into an agreement with them, 50—the Lutherans unite with the Bohemians and Zuinglians in Poland, 155—departure of the Lutherans from their principles in this union, and how they may vindicate themselves, 156—reflections on this union, 157—how the Lutherans are descended from the Albigenses and Vaudois, 163—they seek in vain the succession of persons in these sects, *ib.*—they find still less amongst them the succession of doctrine, 164—the Lutherans are detested by the Calvinists, as defenders of a monstrous opinion, 171—Assembly of Frankfort is for comprehending the Lutherans in the common Confession of Faith it designed to make, 174—letter written to the Lutherans by this Assembly, 175—difference between what was designed to be done at Frankfort and at Sainte-Foy in favour of the Lutherans, from what was since done at Charenton, 180—the Lutherans of Rintel agree with the Calvinists of Marpurg in the Conference of Cassel, 270—the sentiments of the Lutherans, concerning universal grace, give occasion to those of Cameron and his disciples, 272—sentiments of the Lutherans concerning the perpetual visibility of the Church, 282—*Vide* Vol. I.

Lucius III. (Pope) condemns the Vaudois, 90.

Lyons. The poor men of Lyons.—*Vide* Vaudois.

Manicheans. Errors of the Manicheans, progenitors of the Albigenses, 55—consequence from the false principle of the Manicheans, 56—they endeavoured to justify themselves by the usages of the Church, *ib.*—their spirit of seduction and hypocrisy, 57—in order to conceal themselves, they mixed in Catholic assemblies, 58—history of the Paulicians or Arminian Manicheans, *ib.*—their conformity with the Manicheans refuted by St. Austin, 60—their design on the Bulgarians, and Peter of Sicily's instructions, in order to prevent the effect thereof, *ib.*—the Manicheans begin to appear in the West, after the year of our Lord 1000, 61—Manicheans, that came from Italy, discovered at Orleans, under King Robert, *ib.*—their heresy spreads itself into Gascony and Toulouse, 62—the Manicheans of Italy called Cathari, and why, 63

—origin of the Manicheans of Toulouse and Italy; a proof that they came from Bulgaria, *ib.*—Councils of Tours and Toulouse against them, 65—their conformity with the Manicheans known by St. Austin, *ib.*—the same heresy in Germany, *ib.*—sentiments of the German Manicheans, 66—it is discovered that they held two first principles, *ib.* —their variations, and care to conceal themselves, 67—their equivocations when examined about their faith, *ib.*—these heretics examined in full audience of all the people; their tenets related by St. Bernard, who had been thoroughly acquainted with them at Toulouse, 69—they styled themselves Albigenses and Petrubusians, 71—why called Arians, 72—their notion of the Trinity the very same with that of the ancient Manicheans, *ib.*—Manicheans of Soissons, 73—these heretics met with in Agenois and England, 74—the heretics of Montpellier are Manicheans, 76—in the list of the Manichean Churches, drawn by Renier, the Albigenses are comprehended, 80—demonstration that the heretics who denied the Real Presence, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were Manicheans; notoriously false supposition of the Ministers, 122 —Manicheism at Metz, 123—sixteen Churches of the Manicheans comprehend the whole sect, 126—who were those amongst them called Cathari, *ib.*—why St. Paul calls the doctrine of two principles admitted by the Manicheans a doctrine of devils, 159—why, of all heresies, the Holy Ghost hath especially characterized none but Manicheism; character of this heresy; hypocrisy, lying, and a seared conscience, 160.

Marriage, rejected by the Manicheans as bad, 56—Variations of the Manicheans of Germany in relation to marriage, 67—in what respect the Sacrament of Marriage was condemned by the Vaudois, 107—the Albigenses rejected lawful Marriage, 122.

Mass. The Vaudois made no difficulty of coming to Mass, 132—John Huss says Mass, 140—the Mass offends the Bohemian Brethren, 144 —antiquity of the sacrifice of Mass, 278.

Maurice, Prince of Orange, upholds the Gomarists, 228.

Mauzzim, of Daniel, how interpreted by the Minister, 204, 205.

Mede—Vide Joseph Mede.

Melancthon. His bad opinion of Wickliff, 139—acknowledged by the Calvinists for their Father, 178—he allows that it is an easy matter to come to an agreement about the article of Justification, 378.

Menon, one of the Heads of the Anabaptists, 361.

Merit of good works rejected by the Swiss, 43—the merits of Saints owned by Wickliff, 137—the merit of works owned by John Huss, 140—the Trent Council's Doctrine concerning the merit of good works, 375—*Vide* Vol. I.

Ministers (The) decide that the Calvinists may take up arms, 19, 22—the first Huguenot war resolved on by the advice of all the Ministers, and peace made notwithstanding their opposition, 28—proof against the Ministers that the Albigenses were Manicheans, 84—artifices of the Ministers in respect to the history of the Vaudois and Albigenses, 121 —notoriously false suppositions of the Ministers, in order to confound the Vaudois with the Albigenses, 122—two objections of the Ministers to the same purpose, refuted, 125—the Faith of the French Calvinists trusted in the hands of four Ministers, 177—the Ministers cannot believe what they say, 205—vain shifts of the Ministers relating to the business of Sainte-Foy, 179—the System of the Ministers touching the seven Kings of the Revelations evidently confounded by the very terms of this prophecy, 208—their fallacious answer, 210—they account as ill for the ten Kings of the Revelations, 211—what it is the Ministers have discovered in the Revelations concerning their Reformers, 217—the Ministers declare that Semi-Pelagianism doth not damn, 258—and that they were ready to bear with it in the Arminians, 259—the Ministers themselves very much relaxed in the observance of the Dort decrees, 260—the Ministers elude the decree of the Gap Synod, and the thirty-first article of their Confession touching extraordinary vocation, 297, 298.

Ministry. Interruption of the Church's Ministry owned by the Calvinists of France, 295—before the Reformation, the Elect saved in the Roman Ministry by Mr. Claude's confession, 302.

Miracle. Under Edward VI. and under Elizabeth, none of the Miracles admitted by Calvin in the Eucharist are employed, 8.

Montpellier, the Heretics of, were Manicheans, 76.

Mystery. What is that Mystery of Iniquity specified by St. Paul? 161.

Nismes. The national Synod of Nismes in 1572; changes the decree of that of Rochelle concerning the Substance of Jesus Christ's body in the Eucharist, 172.

Ordibarians, who they were, 123.

Ordination. Validity of Ordinations, whereon grounded in England, 11—how the Bohemian Brethren seek their Ordinations in the Catholic Church, 148.

Parliament. The Parliament of England assumes to itself the decision in points of Faith, 10.

Parker, Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, is the first that subscribes Elizabeth's supremacy, 9.

Patarians, who they were, 81—their infamy, 83.

Paulicians, or Manicheans of Armenia, their history, 59—their conformity with the Manicheans refuted by St. Austin, 60—their design on the Bulgarians, *ib.*

Pelagianism. Spite of the Dort decrees, Mr. Jurieu maintains that Pelagianism is not contrary to piety, 261.

Perrin (Paul) quotes not so much as one contemporary Historian in his History of the Vaudois, 116—the books of the Vaudois produced by him, 117—their Confession of Faith which he produces is posterior to Calvinism, 119.

Peter de Bruis appears in the eleventh Century, 53—he clandestinely disseminates his errors in Dauphiny, Provence, and in the neighbourhood of Toulouse, 69—he is chief of the Albigenses, 71—examination of his Doctrine, 84—St. Bernard charges him with nothing but what is true, 87.

Peter du Moulin—Vide Du Moulin.

Peter of Sicily writes the History of the Paulicians and Manicheans of Armenia, 61—endeavours to prevent the spreading of their Sect in Bulgaria, *ib.*

Petrobusians, who they were, 71.

Picards (The) disowned by the Bohemian Brethren, 133.

Piscator, who he was, and his Doctrine on imputed Justice, 180, 181—his Doctrine is detested by the national Synod of Gap, 181—by that of Rochelle in 1607, *ib.*—by that of Privas in 1612, 182—and by that of Tonins in 1614, 183—reflection on the Calvinists' procedure against Piscator, 185—Peter du Moulin puts Piscator's question amongst those things which are of little importance to Salvation, 187—the Synod of Ay approves what Du Moulin says, *ib*.

Poland. The Bohemian Brethren fly thither, 155—and there unite themselves with the Lutherans and Zuinglians, *ib*.

Poles. Remarkable Confession of Faith of the Polish Zuinglians, wherein the Lutherans are ill handled, 48—Ubiquity taught by the Polish Zuinglians, 49—their agreement with the Lutherans and Vaudois, 50.

Poltrot assassinates the Duke of Guise ; this murder looked on, in the Reformation, as an act of Religion, 35.

Poor Men of Lyons—*Vide* Vaudois.

Pope. The Pope of the Albigenses in Bulgaria, 81—hatred of Wickliff and John Huss against the Pope, 139—all goes down with Protestants provided the Pope be exclaimed against, 141—the Calixtins disposed to own the Pope, 143—the Bohemian Brethren offended at the power of the Pope, 144—the Synod of Gap adds an article to the Confession of Faith on purpose to declare the Pope Antichrist, 191—Luther's vain predictions of the Pope's downfal, 192—Daniel and St. Paul extravagantly quoted for proof of the Pope's being Antichrist, *ib*.—Protestants disgrace themselves by this doctrine, 193—the ablest Protestants refute this Doctrine, 196—the Pope's authority over General Councils and the temporals of sovereigns is not of Faith, nor ought to hinder the re-union of Protestants, 383—Jurieu maintains that it is a fundamental article of Faith to believe the Pope Antichrist, 197—the Pope's infallibility is not of Faith, and the contrary opinion cannot be condemned, either as heretical or erroneous, or even as temerarious, 383—*Vide* Vol. I.

Poplicans, or Publicans, who they were, 75—the Ministers make the Vaudois Manicheans, by making them Poplicans, *ib*.

Prayer for the Dead rejected by the Bohemian Brethren, 144.

Predestination. Doctrine of the Arminians, or remonstrance touching Predestination, 230—the disputes about Predestination, according to Mr. Jurieu, no longer intrench on the essentials of Religion, 269.

Presence. Queen Elizabeth will not suffer her Divines to censure the Real Presence, 4—the indifference of the English as to the Real Presence, 7—the Real Presence impugned by Berengarius, 52—by the Albigenses, 83, 85—believed by the Vaudois, 91, 98—manifest proof that the Heretics, who denied the Real Presence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were Manicheans, 122—Real Presence believed by John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, 139, 140—and by the Bohemian Brethren, 149—the assembly of Frankfort minces the difficulty of the Real Presence on purpose to gain the Lutherans, 176—Peter Du Moulin, approved by the Synod of Ay, is against condemning the Real Presence, as believed by the Lutherans, 188—the Real Presence free from venom by the Confession of the Ministers, 264—the Real Presence necessary, 266—*Vide* Reality, *vide* Vol. I.

Pride of the Vaudois, 96, 127, 130.

Primacy of Queen Elizabeth in spirituals established in England, 8—the Catholic Bishops refuse to own it, 9—declaration of the Protestant Clergy in favour of this Primacy, *ib*.—this Doctrine condemned by the Calvinists, 13.

Principle. The Manicheans admitted two first Principles, 55—the Albigenses did the same, 123—why the Doctrine of two Principles is called by St. Paul a Doctrine of Devils, 159.

Privas. The Synod of Privas, in 1612, condemns Piscator's Doctrine, 182.

Prophets. The Prophets of the Protestant Party are cheats, 216—their interpreters no better worth, 217.

Protestants. Difference between Protestants' conduct and that of the Church, 31—what is the succession of Protestants, 52—they reap nothing but shame in making the Albigenses their progenitors, 88—their authority with respect to the original of the Vaudois, 97—Doctrines which Protestants reject in the Vaudois no less than Catholics, 109—Protestants propose new Dogmata to the Vaudois, 110—all pleases them, provided the Pope be exclaimed against, 141—they seek in vain for the succession of Persons and of Doctrine in the Vaudois and Albigenses, 164—they discredit themselves by saying the Pope is Antichrist, 193—why those absurdities endured in the Protestant Party, 215—the Prophets of the Protestant Party are impostors, 216—the arguments employed against the Arminians in the Synod of Dort condemn the whole Protestant Party, 251—according to this Synod, the Protestants were obliged to own the Council of the Catholic Church, 253—the cause of Protestants' Variations proceeding from their ignorance of what the Church is, 281—their sentiments relating to the perpetual Visibility of the Church, *ib.*—this Doctrine the ruin of their Reformation, and the source of their perplexities, 283—what precisely the Protestants are obliged to by this Doctrine, *ib.*—they vary on this head, 289—and why, *ib.*—*Vide* Vol. I.

Purgatory believed by Wickliff, 137—and John Huss, 140—what precisely is to be believed concerning Purgatory agreeably to the Council of Trent, 380—Protestants' principles prove the necessity of Purgatory, *ib.*—the Purification of souls after this life owned by them, *ib.*—they agree as to the main point, but leave the manner undecided, 381—*Vide* Vol. I.

Reality. Queen Elizabeth will not suffer her Divines to censure the Reality, 4—indifference of the English, in respect of the Reality, 7—the Reality condemned by the Zuinglians of Poland, 48—the Reality denied by the Albigenses, 85—believed by the Vaudois, 91, 98—manifest proof that the Heretics, who denied the Reality in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were Manicheans, 122—Reality believed by John Huss, 140—strong expressions of the Bohemian Brethren for the Reality, 149—the Reality free from venom, 264—*Vide* Vol. I., *vide* Real Presence.

Rebaptization of the Bohemian Brethren, 145.

Redemption. The Doctrine of the Arminians concerning the universality of Redemption, 231.

Reformation. Queen Elizabeth approves not the Reformation of Edward VI. in all its points, 2—whether the spirit of the Reformation was a spirit of meekness or violence, 31—effects of that violent spirit which predominated in the Reformation, 32—the Reformation allows private men to arrogate to themselves greater abilities for understanding sound Doctrine than all the rest of the Church, 260—Sects born in the Reformation, 358.

Relics. Vigilantius, in the fourth century, opposes honouring of Relics, 52—St. Leo, St. Basil, and the rest of the Saints of that time, accused of Idolatry by the Ministers, on account of the veneration they shewed to Saints and Relics, 204.

Remonstrants—*Vide* Arminians.

Renaudie (La), chief of the Amboise conspiracy; his character, 18.

Revelations. Illusions of the Protestants relating to the Revelations, 193—exposition of the Minister Jurieu's Doctrine on the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth chapters of the Revelations, 198—the system of the Minister concerning the seven Kings of the Revelations evidently confuted by the very terms of this prophecy, 208—the ten Kings of the Revelations as evidently ill accounted for, 211—contrarieties of the new Interpreters of the Revelations, 213—the Englishman finds England, and the Frenchman, France, in the Revelations, 214—what it is that the Ministers have discovered in the Revelations touching their Reformers, 217.

Revenues of the Church plundered by Elizabeth, Queen of England, 13—*Vide* Vol. I.

Revolt. Beginning of the Calvinists' revolt in France, 15—open revolt of the whole party, 21.

Rochelle. The national Synod of Rochelle in 1571 condemns those of the party that were for changing the Supper-article in the Confession of Faith, 166, 167—decision of this Synod full of perplexity, 167—vain efforts of this Synod to find the substance of the body in the Calvinian Doctrine, 168—error of this Synod endeavouring to explain the mystery of the Eucharist without producing the institution, 169—reason of the Synod for establishing the substance; there it is concluded that the other opinion is contrary to the word of God, 169, 170—it says more than it designed, 170—the Swiss believe themselves condemned by this decision, but the Synod takes care they should be answered that this doctrine only concerns France, 171—the decree of this Synod is changed in that of Nismes, 172—the Synod of Rochelle in 1607 condemns Piscator's Doctrine, 180, 181—it gives orders that the decree of the Synod of Gap, declaring the Pope Antichrist, be printed in all the copies of the Confession of Faith, 195—this Synod declares that nothing ought to be added or taken from the twenty-fifth and twenty-ninth articles of the Confession of Faith, where the Church is treated of, 297.

Roque (Mr. de la). His want of sincerity touching the Vaudois, 97—this Minister artfully confounds the Vaudois with the Albigenses, 122—his false pretence that Wickliff's Doctrine was slandered at the Council of Constance, 136—he proves that John Huss and Jerome of Prague died in the belief of the Church of Rome, especially in what regards the Eucharist, 139, 140.

Roque (Mr. de la), son of the Minister, produces a Confession of Faith of Wickliff's, where the Reality is clearly established, 137.

Roquesane, chief of the sect of the Calixtins, 141—he utterly destroys the Taborites, *ib.*—his ambition prevents the Calixtins re-uniting with the Church, 143—he makes himself Pope in Bohemia, 144—he permits several Greek Priests to celebrate the holy mysteries according to their Church rites, 147.

Runcarians, who they were, 81.

Sacrament. The Albigenses taught that the effect of the Sacraments depends on the holiness of the Ministers, 83—the Vaudois taught that the merit of persons acted in the Sacraments more than order and character, 95—the Vaudois were in no error as to the nature of the Sacraments, 96—what it is they believed of the seven Sacraments, 106—Wickliff teaches that the effect of the Sacraments depends on the merit of persons, 136—the seven Sacraments owned by John Huss, 140—and by the Bohemian Brethren in their Confession, anno 1504, presented to King Ladislaus, 149—they reduce them to two, as Luther prescribes them, 149—they make the Sacraments depend on the merit of the Minister, 150.

Sacrifice. The Calvinists' Doctrine against Piscator solves all the difficulties they propose to us relating to the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, 182.

Sainte-Foy. The Synod of Sainte-Foy, in 1578, consents to a new Confession of Faith, in view of uniting all the Protestants, 176—it trusts its Faith in the hands of four Ministers and of Mr. de Turenne, 177—vain evasions of the Ministers relating to this affair, 179—difference betwixt what was designed to be done in favour of the Lutherans at Sainte-Foy, and what afterwards was done at Charenton, 180.

Salvation. The Calvinists believe that the faithful are sure of their Salvation, 223—the Dort Synod's decision on the certainty of Salvation, 235, 240—false allurement of the certainty of Salvation, 243.

Schoman. George Schoman, one of the chiefs of the Unitarians, 360.

Scotland. The Doctrine settled in England in behalf of the authority of Kings and Parliament as to matters of Faith, is also set up in Scotland, 12.

Scripture. Abuse made of the Scripture by the Vaudois and Albigenses, 128.

Semi-Pelagianism no damning error, according to Mr. Jurieu, 258—this Minister declares they were ready to tolerate Semi-Pelagianism in the Arminians, *ib.*—the other Ministers in the same sentiment with him, 259.

Sendomir. Assembly of Sendomir, where the Lutherans, the Bohemians, and the Zuinglians unite, 155—terms of the Sendomir agreement, 150.

Sin. God the Author of Sin according to the Calvinists, 221—Mr. Jurieu relapses into the excesses of the Reformers with respect to the cause of Sin, 262.

Siscidenses (The), a sect of the Vaudois that refused not to receive the Eucharist from the hands of a Priest, 107.

Socini. Fausto Socini and Lelio heads of the Socinians, 360.

Socinians. The Socinians and the Anabaptists sprung from Luther and Calvin, 359—united together, *ib.*

Soissons. Manicheans at Soissons, 73—their history, *ib.*

Strasburg. Variation of the Church of Strasburg, 361—the senate of Strasburg destroys images, and enjoins the communion under both kinds, *ib.*—suspends the celebration of Mass, 362—those of Strasburg turn Zuinglians, afterwards return to the Confession of Augsburg, *ib.*—they fall into ubiquity, 362, 363.

Substance. Neither under Edward VI., nor under Elizabeth, is the word Substance employed, which Calvin admits in the Eucharist, 8—the Zuinglians' Supper void of Substance, 46—vain endeavours of the national Synod of Rochelle in 1571 to prove the Substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Doctrine of the pretended Reformed of France, 168—the Substance reduced to nothing in the national Synod of Nismes, 172.

Succession. Protestants seek in vain for the Succession of Persons and Doctrine in the Vaudois and Albigenses, 163, 164—what is the Succession of heretics, 165.

Supper. The Supper of the Swiss or Zuinglians without substance, and a presence in virtue only, 46—difference which the Zuinglians of Poland place between their Supper and that of the Socinians, 49—several pretended reformed Churches of France are for changing the Supper-article in the Confession of Faith, 166.

Supremacy of the Kings of England is there established, notwithstanding Queen Elizabeth's qualms of conscience, 8—the Catholic Bishops refuse to sign it, 9—declaration of the Protestant Clergy in England in favour of this Supremacy, *ib.*—this doctrine condemned by the Calvinists, 13.

Swiss. New Confession of Faith of the Helvetic Churches or Swiss, 41—frivolous reasoning of the Ministers concerning this Confession, 42—the Swiss begin but then to know anything of imputed justice, *ib.*—they reject the merit of good works, 43—they attribute true Faith to the Elect alone, *ib.*—they teach the Certainty of Salvation, and the Inamissibility of Grace, and ill explain conversion, 43, 44—their monstrous Doctrine on Free-will, 45—according to them, the Supper is void of substance, and no presence but in virtue, 46—they leave nothing peculiar to the Supper, 47—they are the most sincere defenders of the figurative sense, 48—the Swiss believe themselves condemned by the decision of the national Synod of Rochelle in 1571, 171—they are not satisfied with Beza's answer, but still hold themselves condemned, *ib.*—they are specified by the explication of the Synod of Nismes, 172—Swiss formulary against Universal Grace, 273—another Swiss decision on the Hebrew Text laughed at by the learned of the party, 274—another decision of the Swiss and Geneva reproved by Mr. Claude, *ib.*

Taborites. The sects of Taborites arises in Bohemia, 141—their rebellion and cruelties, *ib.*—their total destruction, 142.

Temples erected in honour of the Saints by the Bohemian Brethren, 154.

Test. Test Act in England, wherein the English draw near to our sentiments, and condemn us only by manifest mistakes, 276.

Testament. The Old Testament rejected by the Manicheans as fabulous, 56—rejected by the Albigenses, 71—received by the Vaudois, 122.

Tonins. The national Synod of Tonins in 1614 condemns Piscator, 183.

Toulouse. The Manicheans of Toulouse, 69—are the same with the Albigenses, 72.

Transubstantiation. Manifest proof that the Vaudois did in no wise err as to that point, 99, 100—this Doctrine impugned by Wickliff, 137—retained by John Huss and Jerome of Prague, 139, 140—and by the Calixtins, 143—rejected by the Bohemian Brethren, 144—the hatred of the Calvinist people turned against Transubstantiation ever since the Synod of Charenton in 1631, 267—the word Transubstantiation chosen at the Council of Lateran, 368—and why—*Vide* Vol. I.

Trent. The Council of Trent hath added nothing to the decisions of the Ancients, 370—it does but repeat the ancient decisions in respect to justifying Grace, 373—in respect to its gratuity, *ib.*—in respect to the preparations to Grace, 374—to the inseparable union of liberty and Grace, 375—to the merit of good works, *ib.*—in respect to the fulfilling of God's commandments, *ib.*—it has cut away the root of all abuses relating to the honour paid to Images, 379—its moderation in determining nothing but what is certain, 381—it speaks not with ambiguity, *ib.*—it has determined all that regards the true authority of the Pope, 382—in it, those are opposed who were for making a formulary whence the Pope's superiority over a general council might be inferred, *ib.*—this formulary suppressed with the Pope's consent, *ib.*

Trinity. The ancient Manicheans' sentiment as to the Trinity, 72—is the same with that of the Toulouse Albigenses, 72, 73.

Turk. Jurieu's ridiculous conceit relating to the Turk, 215.

Turenne, (Mr.) Synod of Sainte Foy trusts its Faith in the hands of four ministers and of Mr. Turenne, 177—why Mr. Turenne employed in this deputation concerning doctrine, *ib.*

Ubiquity taught by the Polish Zuinglians, 49—Peter Du Moulin, whose sentiment is approved by the Synod of Ay, is against condemning Ubiquity, 188—Ubiquity tolerated by the Calvinists, 268.

Unction. What was believed by the Vaudois concerning extreme Unction, 106.

Union of the three Protestant Sects of Poland, 155—reflections on this Union, 157—the assembly of Frankfort is for making an Union between all the defenders of the figurative sense by a common Confession of Faith, 173.

Unitarians—Vide Socinians.

Valdo, author of the Vaudois, 54—who he was, 89—whether a man of learning, 90—his first design, *ib.*—what Paul Perrin says of Valdo, 117.

Variations of the English on the Eucharist, 4—their Variation as to the Adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, 6—their Variation confessed by Mr. Burnet, 14—Variations of the Manicheans of Germany, 67—Variations of the Vaudois since Luther and Calvin's time, 109—Variation of the Reformed of France relating to the Eucharist, 166, 172—Variations of the Swiss concerning the Vulgate, 274—the cause of the Variations of Protestant Churches, 281.

Vaudois (The) agree with the Zuinglians and Lutherans of Poland, 50—they are well treated by the Calvinists, and why, 53—ridiculous pretensions of the Vaudois as to their antiquity; false origin which they boast of, 53, 54—the Ministers make the Vaudois Manicheans in making them Poplicans, 75—many sorts of Heretics called Vaudois, *ib.*—the Vaudois are distinguished from the Manicheans, and, by consequence, from the Albigenses, 76—the beginning of the Vaudois, or Poor Men of Lyons, 88—the abridgment of their history, 89—they are condemned by Pope Lucius III.; they come to Rome, 90—they are accused of nothing relating to the Real Presence, *ib.*—their errors did not regard the Eucharist, 91—they came to beg the approbation of Innocent III., 94—they begin to be treated on the foot of obstinate Heretics, *ib.*—the Church's patience with respect to the Vaudois, 95—their boldness increases by little and little, 96—their doctrine in regard to Church revenues, *ib.*—they were free from error as to the Sacraments, *ib.*—want of sincerity in the Protestant Historians with respect to the Vaudois' original, 97—the Vaudois did not change their doctrine concerning the Eucharist till Luther's time, 98—list of their errors; manifest proof that they were in no error relating to Transubstantiation, 100—they believe the necessity of Confession, 104—in the exterior they performed the duties of Catholics, *ib.*—what it was they believed of the seven Sacraments, 106—in what respect they condemn the Sacrament of marriage, 107—demonstration that the Catholics were neither ignorant of, nor did dissemble the doctrine of the Vaudois, 108—division of the Vaudois' doctrine into three heads, 109—doctrine which the Protestants reject in the Vaudois as well as the Catholics, *ib.*—doctrine which the Catholics approve in the Vaudois, but the Protestants reject, *ib.*—the Vaudois change their doctrine since Luther's and Calvin's time, *ib.*—new tenets proposed to the Vaudois by the Protestants, 110—the Vaudois nowise Calvinists; proof of this from Crespin, 113—proof from Beza, 114—change in the Vaudois of Calabria, and their entire extinction, *ib.*—the Vaudois at present are not predecessors, but disciples of the Calvinists, 115—Vaudois books produced by Perrin, 117—their Confession produced by this author is posterior to Calvinism, 119—manifest proof that the Vaudois had no Confession of Faith antecedently to the pretended Reformation, *ib.*—the Vaudois, in making their Calvinist Confession of Faith, retained something of the Dogmata peculiar to them, 121—reflections on the history of the Vaudois and Albigenses; artifice of the Ministers, *ib.*—notorious false suppositions of the Ministers in order to confound the Vaudois with the Albigenses, 122—whether the word believers signifies the Vaudois in the ancient authors; Aubertin's fallacy, 126—the Vaudois concur not in sentiment with the Calvinists; what we should believe concerning the lives of the Vaudois, 127—their pride, *ib.*—sourness was their character; abuse they made of the Scripture, 128—their presumption, 129—whether one ought to be surprised at their false constancy, 130—inevitable condemnation of these Heretics in that they denied their religion, 131—the Vaudois disowned by the Bohemian brethren, and by the Picards, 132—in what manner the Vaudois sprung from the Albigensian Manicheans, 162.

Vigilantius, in the fourth century, opposes the veneration of relics, and is preferred to St. Jerome by the Protestants, 52.

Visibility of the Church—*Vide* Church.

Vocation. Memorable decision of the Synod of Gap concerning extraordinary Vocation, 297—the Ministers elude this extraordinary Vocation, 298—they are obliged to give up extraordinary Vocation, *ib.*

War. The first civil Wars under Charles IX. which the whole Huguenot party concurs in, 21—these Wars approved in their national Synod, 22—what spirit actuated the Huguenots in these Wars, 24—their vain pretences that these wars did not concern religion, 25—perplexity of the French Calvinists with respect to these Wars, 27—the first War resolved on by the advice of all the Ministers, and peace concluded in spite of them, 28—the other was destitute of all pretext, 30—*Vide* Vol. I.

Wickliff. His impious Doctrine, 52—he never separated from Rome, 53—his Trialogue tumultuates all Bohemia, 133—what was his Theology, *ib.*—he imitates the false piety of the Vaudois, by attributing the effect of the Sacraments to personal merit, 136—his Doctrine nowise slandered at the Council of Constance, *ib.*—his pernicious Doctrine concerning Kings, *ib.*—he consented to the invocation of saints, honoured their images, and believed in purgatory, 137—Wickliff's Confession of Faith produced by Mr. de la Roque, jun., where the Real Presence is clearly laid down and Transubstantiation rejected, *ib.*—this Confession attributed to the Council of London by Mr. de la Roque, 138—the contrary proved by Wickliff himself, *ib.*—Wickliff publicly renounces his Doctrine, and dies in the exterior communion of the Church, *ib.*—Melancthon's judgment concerning Wickliff, 139—his memory respected by the Calixtins, and why, 143.

Wissonats. Andrew Wissonats shews how the Unitarians separated from the Reformed, 360.

Zisca, chief of the Taborites, his bloody feats, 141.

Zuinglians (The) make a new Confession of Faith, 41—they go over to Calvin's notions concerning Grace, 43—man's conversion ill explained by them, 44—their monstrous doctrine concerning Free-will, 46—according to them, the Supper is void of Substance, and the Presence but in virtue, *ib.*—they leave nothing peculiar to the Supper, 47—they are the most sincere defenders of the figurative sense, 48—remarkable Confession of Faith of the Polish Zuinglians, *ib.*—they teach Ubiquity, *ib.*—their agreement with the Lutherans and Vaudois, 50—their union with the Bohemians and Lutherans at Sendomir, 155—the Zuinglians, most of them, recede from their particular principles in this union, 156—reflection on this union, 157.

END OF VOLUME THE SECOND.

Dublin: Printed by RICHARD COYNE.

DATE DUE

[illegible]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01145 2325

DATE DUE

[redacted]

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.